Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

BIS-SOV-91-087
londay
May 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-087 CONTENTS *6 May 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: On 6 May 1991, the DAILY REPORT will begin phasing in new radio and television sourcelines that reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" and "Television Service" designations in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- Churkin Hopeful on Joint Summit With U.S. *[Helsinki Radio]* 1
  - Soviet, U.S. Presidents 'May Meet' *[Moscow International]* 1
- Treaties With East European Nations Planned *[Helsinki Radio]* 1

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

China

- Yazov Statement on Arrival in Beijing *[IZVESTIYA 5 May]* 2
  - Holds Talks With Qin Jiwei *[TASS]* 2
  - Addresses National Defense University *[Moscow International]* 2
  - Visit Linked With Improving Ties *[Moscow International]* 2
- Alekseyev on Developing CPSU-CPC Ties *[Moscow International]* 3
- Commentary Views Taiwan's Lessened Hostility *[Moscow International]* 3

Northeast Asia

- Gorbachev, Japan's Watanabe Discuss Relations *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 4
- Ivashko Meets Japanese LDP Delegation *[TASS]* 5
- Maslyukov Meets With ROK Finance Minister *[Moscow International]* 5
- ROK-Soviet Enterprise Cooperation Viewed *[Moscow International]* 5
- Pyongyang IPU Conference Significance Analyzed *[Moscow International]* 5

Southeast Asia & Pacific

- Vietnam's Do Muoi Arrives in Moscow for Visit *[TASS]* 6
- Bessmertnykh Receives ASEAN Ambassadors *[TASS]* 6

Near East & South Asia

- Commentary Views U.S. Gulf Military Presence *[Moscow International]* 6
- Moscow Cites Interview With PLO's Abu Sharif *[Moscow International]* 7

Sub-Saharan Africa

- Foreign Ministry Issues Statement on Angola *[TASS]* 7

West Europe

- German Troop Withdrawal Accord Takes Effect *[Berlin ADN]* 8
- Gen Varennikov Begins 4-Day Visit to Germany *[TASS]* 8
- TASS Previews Mitterrand Visit 8
- Gorbachev Meets News Corporation Head Murdoch *[TASS]* 9
- UK's Hurd Cited on Need for USSR Stability *[PRAVDA 25 Apr]* 9

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev, Rupert Murdoch Discuss Perestroyka *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 11
    Pavlov Receives Murdoch *[TASS]* 12
Gorbachev Chairs Conference on Soldiers' Injuries *[TASS]* 12
    Further on Conference *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 12
Cabinet of Ministers Presidium Holds Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 12
    More on 3 May Cabinet Session *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 May]* 13
Memorial Group Protests in Moscow *[Radio Rossii]* 14
Further on Alleged Presidents' Document *[Radio Rossii]* 15
PRAVDA Festival Held in Moscow 3-4 May 15
    Frolov Opens Festival *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 15
    Frolov Views Plans, Goals *[Radio Rossii]* 16
    Frolov on Circulation, Slogan *[TASS]* 17
    Ivashko on PRAVDA's Importance *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 17
    Prokofyev on Democratization *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 17
    Papers Said 'Deceiving' Readers *[Radio Rossii]* 18
    SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Praised *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 18
    PRAVDA Report Contested *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 May]* 18
    Decline in Newspaper Sales Predicted *[IZVESTIYA 2 May]* 19
    New Newspaper Set To Publish *[Moscow Radio]* 21
TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press for 4 May 21
TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press for 5 May 21
TASS Reviews Central Press for 6 May 22
Ivashko Chairs CPSU Central Committee Meeting *[TASS]* 23
Participant Praises Usefulness of CPSU Plenum *[TASS]* 24
Only 'United, Organized' CPSU Can Be Strong *[PRAVDA 1 May]* 24
Shevardnadze Warns About Dictatorship *[Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG 5 May]* 25
Shevardnadze on Environmental Imperatives *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 26
Former Leaders' Diplomatic Postings Listed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 May]* 27
Pension Fund Reported in 'Catastrophic' State *[IZVESTIYA 2 May]* 28
Afghan Veterans Union Officially Registered *[IZVESTIYA 1 May]* 28
Murmansk Officer Falsified Union Poll Results *[MOSCOW NEWS No.14]* 28
Kalugin Hit for Claims on Markov Murder *[PRAVDA 23 Apr]* 29

Economic

11 Kuzbass Mines Resume Operations *[Moscow TV]* 29
Ukraine Miners Back at Work *[IZVESTIYA 6 May]* 29
Coal Strike Resumes in Vorkuta *[TASS]* 30
Cabinet Orders Study of Price Rise Compensation *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 30
Consumers Reportedly Wary of Compensation *[TRUD 24 Apr]* 30
Economic Aspects of Union Treaty Spotlighted *[IZVESTIYA 1 May]* 32

Scientific

Japanese Partner's Bankruptcy Strains Energiya *[TASS]* 34
Mir Cosmonauts Preparing To Undock Vehicle *[TASS]* 34
    Crews Accomplishments Reviewed *[TASS]* 34
Soviet-British Crews Leave for Launch Site *[TASS]* 35

Military

Army Paper Defends Baltic Servicemen's Union *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Apr]* 35
Officials Comment on Soviet Military Spending *[Moscow International]* 35

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

- European Parliament Delegation Visits Estonia *[Tallinn Radio]* 37
- Latvia Celebrates Independence Anniversary 37
  - Gorbunovs Delivers Speech *[Riga Radio]* 37
  - Godmanis Gives Speech *[Riga Radio]* 38
- Gorbunovs, Godmanis, Dinevics Hold Briefing *[Riga Radio]* 41
- Latvian Independence Jubilee Celebrations Viewed *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 43
- Latvian Special Militia Chief Wounded in Shooting *[TASS]* 44
- Latvian Deputy Informs Danes of Baltic Situation *[Riga Radio]* 44
- Sajudis Seimas Council Holds 4 May Rally 44
  - More Than 100,000 Demonstrate *[AFP]* 44
  - Landsbergis Addresses Rally *[Vilnius Radio]* 45
  - Resolution Read at Rally *[Vilnius Radio]* 46
  - Council Chairman Tumelis Issues Appeal *[Vilnius Radio]* 47
- Lithuania Seeks Neutrality, Good Relations *[Berlin ADN]* 47
- Lithuania Greets Latvian Independence Anniversary *[Vilnius International]* 47
- Soldiers Attack Photographer Outside Vilnius Base *[Vilnius International]* 48

RSFSR

- Yeltsin, Kryuchkov Discuss RSFSR KGB *[TASS]* 48
  - Agreement Outlined *[TASS]* 48
  - Ivanenko Appointed Acting Chief *[TASS]* 48
- Yeltsin Interviewed on Kuzbass Visit *[Moscow TV]* 49
- Yeltsin Issues Instructions on Management Changes *[TASS]* 52
- Yeltsin Views Strike, Constitution Issues *[Radio Rossii]* 53
- Social Democrats Nominate Yeltsin for Presidency *[TASS]* 54
- Ryzhkov Decides To Run for Russian President *[TASS]* 54
- Prokofyev Report at Moscow Gorkom Plenum *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Apr]* 55
- Moscow Gorkom's Prokofyev Interviewed *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 61
- Effects of RSFSR-Lithuania Treaty Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 19 Apr]* 66

WESTERN REPUBLICS

- Situation 'Getting More Tense' in Moldova *[TASS]* 67
- Moldova Party Secretaries View National Situation *[TASS]* 67
- Moldova, Estonia Sign Economic Accord *[Moscow Radio]* 67
- Moldovan Official on Soviet Army Call-up *[TASS]* 67
- Moldovan CP Issues Economic Forecast *[TASS]* 68

Caucasus

- Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan's Activities Reported 68
  - Views Meeting With Gorbachev *[Radio Rossii]* 68
  - Replies to Gorbachev Draft Protocol *[Yerevan Radio]* 69
  - Gives Briefing on Gorbachev Meeting *[TASS]* 69
  - Calm Attributed to Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 69
  - Interviewed on Crisis *[Radio Rossii]* 70
- Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Meets on Situation *[Baku Radio]* 70
  - Protests Armenian Supreme Soviet Moves *[TASS]* 70
- Nagorno-Karabakh Situation Seen as 'Real War' *[Moscow Radio]* 71
- Shatalin: 'War' on Armenia-Azerbaijan Border *[IZVESTIYA 6 May]* 71
- Yerevan Reviews Border Situation 5 May *[Yerevan Radio]* 72
- Statement Issued on Armenia-Azerbaijan Situation *[TASS]* 72
- Baku News Conference Views Armenian Relations *[Moscow TV]* 72
- Armenian MVD on Presence of Soviet Troops *[Yerevan Radio]* 73
- MVD, Defense Ministry Transcaucasus Statement *[TASS]* 73
- Armenian, MVD Views on Village Incident *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 May]* 74
- Gorbachev Rules Out Deportation of Armenians *[Yerevan Radio]* 75

Central Asia

- Kazakh Official on Draft Union Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 22 Apr]* 75

Churkin Hopeful on Joint Summit With U.S.

LD0305134691 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1300 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] The next summit between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States may still take place by the end of June. The chief Foreign Ministry spokesman, Vitaliy Churkin, who is visiting Finland, said in Helsinki that the summit meeting was only postponed because of the Persian Gulf war and the continuing preparation of arms limitation agreements.

[Begin Churkin recording, in English] The two presidents agreed that during the war in the Persian Gulf it was not proper for the U.S. President to travel abroad. Furthermore, the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms was not yet fully prepared, so they decided to hold their summit in the first half of 1991, and that understanding is still there. [end recording]

At his news conference, Churkin also touched upon the situation in the Baltic states. Churkin regards the expressions of opinion by outside countries as reprehensible while the Baltic states and the central Soviet leadership are organizing their relations. Churkin expects the Soviet republics to sign a new Union treaty with the central leadershiip this month. Six republics, including the Baltic states, have refused to sign the treaty.

Soviet, U.S. Presidents 'May Meet'

LD0305180191 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, Vitaliy Churkin, has said Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and American President George Bush may meet in the first half of this year.

Addressing an impromptu news conference in Finland, he recalled that scheduled for the start of the new year, the Soviet-American summit had been postponed rather than cancelled.

Among the reasons for the postponement, Churkin referred to the American President's preoccupation with the war in the Persian Gulf and the lack of progress at negotiations between experts on conventional arms.

As these reasons have tapered off, Churkin said, the presidents have decided to meet and they mean it.

Treaties With East European Nations Planned

LD0305201691 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1600 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] The Soviet Union intends to negotiate a friendship treaty with each Eastern European country corresponding to the needs of that country; therefore, all agreements will be different. This was stated by the press spokesman of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Vitaliy Churkin, in Helsinki today. According to Churkin, the friendship treaties can be regarded as a basis on which the Soviet Union starts building its relations with the countries of Eastern Europe. A new friendship treaty has already been concluded with Romania. Previously, the foundation of the Soviet Union's relations with Eastern Europe consisted of the Warsaw Pact.

China

Yazov Statement on Arrival in Beijing

PM0405175791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by TASS correspondents Vladimir Kashirov and Sergey Sorokin: "D.T. Yazov in China"]

[Excerpt] Beijing, 3 May— Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister, arrived here today on an official visit at the invitation of Colonel General Qin Jiwei, PRC minister of defense.

We have arrived in friendly China, the country with which we have our longest border, the USSR defense minister told a TASS correspondent on arrival. He stressed that since M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the PRC relations between our two countries have changed substantially for the better, although the Soviet and Chinese people's attitude toward each other has never been bad, irrespective of the chilly winds that used to blow at one time. We have come in the hope of getting to know China better. Of course, my prime interest is the military friends and colleagues with whom we are exchanging views on a number of points of interest to both sides. [passage omitted]

Holds Talks With Qin Jiwei

LD0305121691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1135 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] Beijing, 3 May (TASS)—D.T. Yazov's conversation with Qin Jiwei, which passed in a friendly and businesslike atmosphere, took place at the Diayutai State Guesthouse during the afternoon. The sides noted that a propitious stage of normalization is currently being experienced in Soviet-Chinese relations, following the well-known period of cool relations.

The cooperation in the military field represents a substantial aspect of the current broadening of the multifarious and mutually beneficial ties between the USSR and China on a constructive basis. This cooperation exerts a positive influence on security in the Asia-Pacific region and the whole world.

The participants are in favor of restoring the military cooperation between the Soviet Union and China on the broadest range of issues.

On the same day, at the central square of the Chinese capital, D.T. Yazov laid a wreath at the monument to national heroes amid a festive atmosphere.

In the evening the PRC defense minister hosted a reception at the National Assembly building in honor of the Soviet guest and those accompanying him.

Addresses National Defense University

OW0405184891 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 4 May 91

[Text] Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Yazov, Soviet minister of defense, who is currently on an official visit to China, gave a speech at the Chinese National Defense University on Saturday. He discussed the present condition of Soviet-Chinese cooperation and the prospects for its development, including military cooperation; the important theories and measures underlying Soviet military policies; and the Soviet position on solving the problem of security in the Asia-Pacific region and in the world.

The Soviet defense minister left Beijing to visit other areas of China on the same day.

Visit Linked With Improving Ties

OW0405181991 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 2200 GMT 3 May 91

[Report on interview with Soviet Lieutenant-General (Soroning) by station reporter (Galibov)—date, place not given; from the "Hello, China" program]

[Text] Friends, Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov is in China currently on an official visit, the first to China by a high- ranking Soviet military official in several decades. The visit marks the beginning of direct contacts between the two countries' defense ministers. It seems the visit also signifies the complete normalization of relations between the two countries. At the same time, contacts between high-ranking military leaders will lay the foundation for direct ties between leaders of the respective military regions, beginning with the border area military regions, of the two countries.

Lieutenant General (Soroning), director of the Political Department of the Soviet Far East Military Region, in an interview with this station's reporter, (Galibov), said: There has been no direct contact between the commanders of the respective military regions of our two countries. I believe that with the improvement of relations between our two countries and as a result of the meeting between the high-ranking military leaders of the two countries, direct contacts between the headquarters of our Far East Military Region and the Military Region in China's Heilongjiang Province will be possible in the near future. I believe that under the present conditions, direct contacts between individual units of both armed forces will be of great significance and have a positive impact on other events in the Far East.

Lieutenant General (Soroning) was asked to discuss in detail the concrete steps that have been taken for easing military tension in the region. He said: Of course, I believe that the cessation of military confrontation between the Soviet Union and China is one of the important events in the Far East region. The two countries' troops deployed along the border areas are being reorganized into defensive units, and many have been withdrawn, or are being withdrawn, from the boundary lines. Only regular border guard units remain at border areas. I believe the reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces deployed in the Asian region also is an important contribution to easing military tension. We have reorganized some units and simplified the large-scale administrative organs for armies [bing tuan] and group armies [ji tuan jun]. I want to point out that the decision adopted by the Soviet Government on reducing its armed forces in the Far East was carried out on schedule. Another very important point is that all military exercises conducted by the Military Region in recent years have been of a defensive nature. We have begun to invite foreign observers and reporters to watch our military exercises.

Lieutenant General (Soroning) also was asked what he wishes to discuss with his Chinese counterpart. He said: I believe that we should first discuss professional questions. I also believe that we can quickly reach agreement with our Chinese counterparts on exchanging experiences in the education and political and military training of officers and men, as well as in mastering military techniques. Through this we can improve ourselves by learning from each other. Another very important point is that our military ideas are defensive in nature. Therefore, we can maintain constructive dialogue to safeguard the sound foundation for peace and security in the Far East and the entire Asia-Pacific region.

In conclusion, Lieutenant General (Soroning) said: The peoples, as well as their component parts, the armed forces, of our two countries, all are looking forward to this.

Alekseyev on Developing CPSU-CPC Ties

OW0305185491 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1000 GMT 2 May 91

[Alekseyev commentary; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] The ties between the CPSU and the CPC have become an important aspect of the two countries' cooperation at the present stage. Station observer Alekseyev comments in this regard.

I believe that I am not mistaken in claiming that Gorbachev's announcement of the resumption of ties between the CPSU and the CPC during his May 1989 visit to China elicited special interest throughout the world. That is understandable. If the state-to-state relations between the Soviet Union and China deteriorated at the end of 1950's and early 1960's, such relations at least were maintained in the ensuing years. We cannot say that with regard to relations between the two parties, however. Such relations virtually did not exist. Nearly two years have elapsed since the resumption of ties between the two parties. How have the ties between the two parties developed in those two years? I especially want to point out that these ties have the quality of seeking truth from facts. The two parties have stressed the task of exchanging experiences in various fields so that each country can make use of beneficial things. CPC delegations that have visited the Soviet Union have shown interest in CPSU activities, in the party's style and method of party work, in the roles of party organizations in realizing economic and political reforms, in the interrelationship between the CPSU and social factions and organizations, and in other activities of the CPSU. Meanwhile, the CPSU delegations that visited China also had similar aims. Over the last two years, several CPSU delegations, including some high-level ones, have visited China. For example, in February and March of this year a CPSU delegation headed by Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited, as did a CPSU Leningrad Oblast party committee delegation headed by Gidaspov, first secretary of the CPSU Leningrad Oblast Party Committee, which just returned from China. When talking with a station reporter, Gidaspov stressed that his visit had been fruitful.

We, as well as the CPC, have the firm conviction that this cooperation will benefit both parties greatly. There is big room for cooperation between the two countries and the two peoples. Both the Soviet Union and China are faced with daunting tasks. We can accomplish these tasks together. During his visit, Gidaspov, first secretary of the CPSU Leningrad Oblast Party Committee, was received by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee. They conducted a lengthy discussion. Gidaspov said that Jiang Zemin's proposed visit to the Soviet Union in May undoubtedly will have great significance in further developing the cooperation between the two parties and the two countries.

Commentary Views Taiwan's Lessened Hostility

OW0405034991 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0700 GMT 2 May 91

[Mikhailov commentary from the "Asian Affairs" program]

[Text] Taiwan's leader, Li Teng-hui, officially announced the end of the 40-odd years of hostility toward Beijing on Tuesday. Please listen to a piece on this issue written by our station commentator Mikhailov.

The decision by the Taiwan authorities is seen as a step to ease tension in relations across the Taiwan Strait. Observers held that the fact that Taiwan has changed its reference to the Chinese government from the "communist bandits" to the "Beijing authorities" can be interpreted as a final admission of their current political reality. This has eliminated the obstacles toward the establishment of closer contacts and may also clear the way for direct talks on reunification between the two sides.

The Beijing authorities have long urged Taipei to start talks on reunification, and both sides of the strait have also repeatedly reiterated the need to reunify the country. Beijing proposed the "one country, two systems" reunification plan, under which Taiwan will be able to maintain its status as a special administration zone with a social system different from that of the mainland for a long period of time. Beijing has also proposed expanding bilateral contacts and held that the establishment of direct contacts will enhance mutual understanding. Meanwhile, Taipei proposed another reunification plan—the "one country, two regions" plan. It also put forward a series of conditions to Beijing that include implementing reform to democratize the country, adopting the free economy system, officially renouncing the plan to use force against Taiwan, and refraining from creating obstacles to Taipei's efforts to expand its international relations.

At present, the "three no's" policy of "no contact, no negotiation and no compromise" toward the mainland has still not been officially renounced in Taiwan although all signs indicated that it will soon be abolished. The Taiwan's Straits Exchange Foundation's current visit to Beijing for talks on resumption of contacts also proved this point. The organization was established late last year as a nongovernmental organization; however, quoting the words of Chen Chang-wen, the head of the delegation, the delegation is entrusted by the Taiwan government to visit Beijing. It must be pointed out that although the "three no's" policy still exists, contacts across the Taiwan Strait have grown much closer recently. According to estimates, more than 1 million Taiwanese are expected to enter the mainland this year. The volume of indirect trade between the two sides and the volume of Taiwanese investment in the mainland have also experienced tremendous growth in the last few years. Taiwan's decision to end hostility has aroused positive response in Beijing. The Chinese Government has also announced that it will stop its propaganda broadcasts to Taiwanese troops and personnel stationed on islands close to the mainland.

Of course, it is too early to talk about mainland-Taiwan reunification now, as there is still a high degree of distrust and caution in Beijing-Taiwan relations. Nonetheless, recent steps taken by the two sides have led people to believe the process toward reunification is about to start very soon.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev, Japan's Watanabe Discuss Relations

CM0605104991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 May (TASS)—M.S. Gorbachev, USSR president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, 5 May met with a delegation of the Liberal Democratic Party of Japan led by Michio Watanabe. The delegation included Members of Parliament T. Yamaguchi, M. Nakayama, T. Yamazaki, Y. Uekusa, T. Makino, A. Amari, and H. Miyazaki.

The arrival of such a prestigious delegation soon after the summit meeting, M.S. Gorbachev stressed, signifies that the Soviet- Japanese dialogue is continuing. He expressed satisfaction with the scope and the generally friendly talks with Prime Minister T. Kaifu. The friendliness, affability, and cordiality of the Japanese made a deep impression, as did the earnestness of the approach to Japanese-Soviet relations on the part of the business world.

Since a desire for good, warm [dobrym, khoroshim] relations with Japan is also obvious on the part of the Soviet people, something confirmed during the debate on the outcome of his visit at the USSR Supreme Soviet, there is only one conclusion: All possible use should be made of the stimulus of the first Soviet-Japanese summit meeting and both sides should work steadily on improving the atmosphere and on moving toward one another. This will help in finding answers to any questions.

A presidential decree is now under preparation, the draft of which will be worked through by the leadership of the Russian Federation and in the relevant departments, which will lay the foundation for the implementation on our part and in conjunction with representatives of Japan of agreements and other accords that have been signed.

In the words of M. Watanabe, people in Japan assess the USSR president's visit as of great historical significance. At the same time, he voiced regret that an agreement was not reached on the territorial problem.

M.S. Gorbachev iterated the logic to which he adhered during his visit: The development of Soviet-Japanese relations is in the interests of the Soviet and Japanese peoples and it is from this that politicians should proceed, firmly advancing and expanding mutually advantageous ties between the two countries and carefully taking into account and respecting each other's interests in the search for solutions acceptable to both.

The subject of the place of Soviet-Japanese relations in the overall international context was touched upon. The visit attracted great attention throughout the world, although various assessments and attitudes toward the improvement of Soviet-Japanese ties were expressed. In any event this testifies the understanding that it is a question of a very important link in world politics. The development of Soviet-Japanese relations must not be to the detriment of anyone, the participants in the conversation agreed. We hold a clear position, the president said. The United States has its own interests, Japan has its own interests, the European countries, China, India, other Asian countries, and so on have their own interests. So, too, does the USSR of course. Anyone who insists exclusively upon his own interests without regard for those of others condemns politics to failure. A sensible balance is necessary, one has to be able to reconcile interests—that is the main task of politicians.

Incidentally the importance of the visit to Japan lies in the fact that an impetus was given to the search for a balance of this kind.

We have good relations with the United States, the president continued, and we intend to move them forward. But we are in favor of good relations with China and Japan, too, and we are in favor of the United States having good relations with those countries. And it is important to implement this course consistently and calmly everywhere.

M. Watanabe said that Japan remains true to its friendly relations with a number of countries and primarily with the United States. But this is certainly no obstacle to cooperation with the Soviet Union, especially if a firm foundation of trust is created in Soviet-Japanese relations.

Concluding the conversation, M.S. Gorbachev said: We have spent this hour with advantage. You, Mr. Watanabe, note the importance of the first visit to Japan by a president of the USSR. I note the importance of your first visit to the USSR after the first Soviet- Japanese summit meeting, which, as we have agreed, will not be the last.

Taking part were V.M. Falin, A.I. Volskiy, K.N. Brutents, and Ambassador S. Edamura.

Ivashko Meets Japanese LDP Delegation

LD0505224391 Moscow TASS in English 2118 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—Deputy Chief of the Soviet Communist Party Vladimir Ivashko met a delegation from the Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] of Japan led by Michio Watanabe at the CPSU Central Committee on Sunday.

The talk concerned President Mikhail Gorbachev's recent visit to Japan and specific tasks of developing bilateral relations in a variety of areas, stemming from the results of this visit.

The sides noted the importance of maintaining and deepening contacts between the CPSU and the Liberal Democratic Party and also effectively utilising opportunities for developing interparliamentary ties. They emphasised the benevolent reaction of the two countries' public to the prospect of achieving good neighbourliness between the USSR and Japan.

The talk also focused on some international issues of mutual interest.

Valentin Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Sumio Edamura, Japan's ambassador to the USSR, attended the meeting.

Maslyukov Meets With ROK Finance Minister

SK0605011891 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 2 May 91

[From the "Cooperation News" program under the "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program]

[Text] Talks between Soviet Vice Premier Yuriy Maslyukov and ROK Finance Minister Chong Yong-ui, who is on a visit to the Soviet Union, were held in Moscow. They exchanged views on the economic cooperation between the two countries and discussed the development and prospective of fulfilling the economic cooperation.

ROK-Soviet Enterprise Cooperation Viewed

SK0605044391 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 2 May 91

[From the "Cooperation News" feature of the "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program]

[Text] (Chon Si-yon), director of a section of the ROK Kohap Group, visited Khabarovsk City in the Far East.

A branch of the large company will soon open there. Kohap Group holds friendly relations with various enterprises in the Far East, including crude-oil processing plants in Komsomolsk and (Amur) City.

Technology in the production of shoes have been discussed, and the plan to cooperate with (Dirok Vivijan), a plant producing stockings and shirts, has been sounded out. It is expected that a joint enterprise for producing consumer goods will be established.

Pyongyang IPU Conference Significance Analyzed

SK0505111791 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 4 May 91

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] The 85th Inter-Parliamentary Union [IPU] conference is now in session in Pyongyang. Station correspondent reports the following:

Pyongyang has never hosted such a prestigious international conference as the IPU conference. Some 500 legislators from 86 countries are attending this meeting. Among them are delegates from the United States, the Soviet Union, China, and Japan.

Even the meeting's program, which includes such pressing issues as non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and other conventional weapons of mass destruction, respect for human rights, protecting children and women from violence, and stabilization of situation in the Far East, is respectful.

Simply put, those participating in the conference are intensely discussing issues that are worrisome to mankind.

Remarks by President of the DPRK Kim Il-song in his speech delivered at the opening session of the conference have attracted affirmative reaction. The North Korean leader noted that disarmament and the removal of nuclear weapons and other conventional weapons of mass destruction constitutes the most pressing task to be fulfilled for peace. He called for the creation of a nuclear-free peace zone as well as for a new and fair international order.

Legislators are paying attention not only to general questions, but also to difficulties facing the Third World countries. They demanded that foreign debt owed by the developing countries be written off and that the effort for the removal of poverty, starvation, and disease be supported. They also noted the need to abide by human rights, freedom, humanitarianism, and social justice.

The participants in the conference unanimously stated that the IPU should play the important role of mediator for regional feuds and should take it upon itself to promote trust and cooperation between peoples.

(Aleksey Yeliseyev), head of the Soviet delegation, called on the participants in the conference to support a Soviet proposal for a summit meeting of the Northeast Asian countries. This meeting will lay the legal foundation for mediation of conflicts and feuds among the countries.

The participation in the conference by a ROK delegation drew great attention from reporters. The ROK lawmakers were the first to visit Pyongyang since the peninsula was divided. Their visit this time can serve as a wonderful opportunity to reopen the South-North talks suspended last year.

As pointed out by the participants in the conference, the Pyongyang meeting has promoted trust among the parliamentarians from various countries. This means that trust among these countries has also been promoted accordingly.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnam's Do Muoi Arrives in Moscow for Visit

LD0505123491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1217 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 May (TASS)—Do Muoi, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam [SRV], arrived in Moscow today for a working visit at the invitation of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

The Vietnamese guest was met at the airport by Fedor Senko, USSR deputy prime minister, and other officials. Among those meeting him was Nguyen Manh Cam, the SRV ambassador to the USSR.

Bessmertnykh Receives ASEAN Ambassadors

LD0505190391 Moscow TASS in English 1850 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh on Sunday received ambassadors of the ASEAN countries to the USSR Janwar Marah Djani from Indonesia, Mohamed Harun from Malaysia, Joseph Francois Conceicao from Singapore, Casita Piroma from Thailand and Charge d'Affaires ad interim J. Kirolhico from the Philippines.

They discussed the situation in the Asia-Pacific region, focusing on Southeast Asia.

Bessmertnykh reiterated the Soviet Union's readiness to develop an extensive dialogue with ASEAN, taking into account an important role it plays in the regional and world politics and the proximity of positions of the USSR and ASEAN on urgent international issues.

The ambassadors expressed interest in developing a dialogue with the Soviet Union, which can become a major partner in solving many political and economic problems in the region.

Near East & South Asia

Commentary Views U.S. Gulf Military Presence

LD0605110391 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 5 May 91

[Aleksiy Zlatorunskiy commentary]

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney begins his tour of the Gulf today [5 May]. Reports from Washington reveal that Cheney intends to visit the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates. A spokesman for the U.S. Defense Department has announced that during his meetings with Gulf leaders Mr. Cheney intends to discuss postwar security. The GCC [Gulf Cooperation Council] foreign ministers are meeting in Kuwait today to discuss this very issue.

Nobody can possibly deny that the formation of a security structure is an extremely important matter. The lessons learned from the Iraqi aggression on Kuwait show that attempts to use force to achieve political goals cannot be ruled out so long as such an order is not set up. However, when we talk about the elements which should constitute this order, opinions vary. According to information provided by the U.S. defense secretary, it can be confirmed that Richard Cheney intends to discuss in the Gulf countries the prospects of establishing a forward position for the U.S. Central Command in the region.

Washington plans to keep $5 billion worth of weapons in the Gulf region, including tanks, armored vehicles, and guns. This was announced by the U.S. ASSOCIATED PRESS news agency. But this is not all. The representatives of the U.S. Defense Department are not hiding the fact that the permanent presence of the U.S. Navy in the Gulf region will be increased. Military exercises will be conducted on a continuous basis and units of the U.S tactical Air Force will be sent to the Gulf region to pay visits [to the various countries].

What then is the position of the Gulf countries on Washington's plans? There are different positions. Kuwait is the only country which in practice supports the U.S. military presence. We can understand its position in principle, because it was itself the victim of the Iraqi aggression. But, as the other members of the Gulf Cooperation Council have pointed out, foreign military presence has never guaranteed the security of a country or a region. On the contrary, it has caused many political difficulties. For this very reason, Egypt and Syria proposed in March the creation of an Arab deterrent force. According to the plan proposed by Cairo and Damascus, Egyptian and Syrian troops, which are part of the multinational forces and which have not returned home yet, could constitute the backbone of this force. Syria and a number of other countries believe that without Iran's contribution the establishment of a security order in the Gulf will be impossible to achieve. However, the deputy secretary general of the Gulf Cooperation Council announced, on behalf of the Council, that Iran's participation in the security order can only be political. It is not unlikely that the obvious anti-American stand taken by the Iranian leadership has something to do with this.

I believe that nobody will dispute the right of the Gulf countries and the neighboring states to establish a security order which suits them. As for the position of the Soviet Union, it is well known. The level of foreign military presence in the Gulf region must return to the level which existed prior to the Iraqi aggression. This is in line with the way international relations are developing.

Moscow Cites Interview With PLO's Abu Sharif

LD0305200891 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] Here is a report from Tunis. This is what Ivan Menshikov, NOVOSTI correspondent, says on the telephone at the request of Radio Moscow in an interview with one of the PLO leaders:

Ivan Menshikov addressed the following question to Bassam Abu Sharif, Yasir 'Arafat's adviser: What do the Palestinians want from the regional conference which is scheduled to be held?

Bassam Abu Sharif said: First of all to discuss the main issue there which is putting an end to the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories. If this principled condition is taken into account, the issue of forming the Palestinian delegation to the conference will not have a particular importance. Bassam Abu Sharif recalled that the Palestinian Central Council agreed on contacts between Palestinian personalities from the occupied territories and the American Government personalities who aim at convening the regional conference.

President Yasir 'Arafat's adviser said: The adoption of this decision was a difficult matter as far as we are concerned; however, we proceeded from the fact that the Israeli Government must not be given pretexts to accuse the PLO of shouldering the responsibility for foiling the peace process whose signs have appeared in the Middle East.

Bassam Abu Sharif sees that the unrealistic and stubborn stand of Israel itself at the moment constitutes the main obstacle in the way toward the convening of the regional conference for a settlement in the Middle East and holding it with success.

In his interview with the Soviet journalist, Bassam Abu Sharif pointed out that the continuous influence in Israel, under these circumstances, of the two (countries) chairing this conference—the United States and the Soviet Union—can have positive results.

The PLO wants, alone with the other concerned Arab countries, to address the following official call to Washington: Reducing the volume of American assistance to Israel in order to show the seriousness of its intention in organizing the peace process in the region.

Bassam Abu Sharif sees the Soviet Union, which has become one of the main sources of new refugees to Israel, also has possibilities to influence Tel Aviv's stand.

Yasir 'Arafat's political adviser said that at the end of the talks, which were held by the delegation from the PLO Executive Committee, a principle agreement was reached with regard to holding a meeting between the Palestinian president and Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh during his forthcoming visit to the Middle East countries. This meeting may become an important share in the efforts to organize the regional and international conference for a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

This was the view of Bassam Abu Sharif which he gave to the Soviet journalist accredited to Tunis, Ivan Menshikov.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Foreign Ministry Issues Statement on Angola

LD0405180291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1640 GMT 4 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 4 May (TASS)—A statement by the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the situation in Angola was issued here today. It says:

"As a result of talks lasting more than a year between delegations of the government of the People's Republic of Angola and the Angolan opposition organization UNITA, accords have been reached which should put an end to the protracted armed conflict in that country. On

1 May in Lisbon, agreements on peace in Angola were initialled. The official signing of a cease-fire agreement, which will come into force at once, is due to take place at the end of May. Other documents relating to the settlement will be signed at the same time.

The talks have been intensive and covered many aspects. From April 1990 they have been held with the mediation of the government of Portugal. Soviet observers have actively participated in them. The United Nations has indicated willingness to cooperate. The negotiation process has been supported by many African and other states.

In the course of the talks the belligerents came to realize that the fratricidal war which has torn Angola for more than 15 years is ruinous and hopeless. Readiness for reasonable compromise in the higher interests of the Angolan people has prevailed.

A great and positive role has been played by cooperation between Portugal, the USSR, and the United States, and also by the general orientation of the world community in favor of a political settlement in the spirit of the new thinking.

We are close to a triumph of common sense in Angola. Let us hope that this time that triumph will be thorough and final. However, if the settlement is to be reliably ensured and setbacks avoided, it will still be necessary to overcome the mutual distrust that has built up over the years. The government of the People's Republic of Angola and UNITA must exercise the utmost restraint in their actions, and there must be an effort by all the political forces of Angola, and also by the foreign participants involved in this process.

The Soviet Union welcomes this important success on the Angolan people's path toward peace and stability, socio-economic recovery, and the establishment of democracy. The consolidation of the positive results which have been achieved would now undoubtedly be helped by a cessation of all deliveries of arms and ammunition to Angola. The Soviet Union is willing, without delay and without waiting for a cease-fire, to begin implementing the specific understanding on this point which has been reached with the United States, and, together with the United States, to call on all other countries to refrain from such deliveries.

For its part, the Soviet Union will continue to promote the improvement of the situation in Angola, and Southern Africa in general."

West Europe

German Troop Withdrawal Accord Takes Effect

LD0605103191 Berlin ADN in German 1004 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—The 12 October 1990 agreement between Germany and the Soviet Union on conditions for the limited stay and the logistics of the planned withdrawal of Soviet troops came into force today. German Ambassador Dr. Klaus Blech and USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh exchanged the ratification documents this morning. During the ceremony they said the agreement was an important investment in the future of German-Soviet relations.

Gen Varennikov Begins 4-Day Visit to Germany

LD0505090191 Moscow TASS in English 0846 GMT 5 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Chestyakov]

[Text] Bonn May 5 TASS—General of the Army Valentin Varennikov, commander-in-chief of Soviet land forces and deputy defence minister, arrived in Germany for a visit on Saturday at the invitation of Lieutenant-General Henning von Ondarza, inspector-general of the Bundeswehr's land forces.

The four-day visit is being made in response to a similar visit to the Soviet Union by von Ondarza in October last year.

Later in the day the Soviet general visited the Soviet Defence Ministry [as recieved] where he had a talk with Ondarza who told him about the organisation, structure and principles of command in the German land forces.

The programme of the visit includes Varennikov's meeting with German Defence Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg, a tour of combat units and educational establishments of the Bundeswehr and conversations with soldiers and officers of the German armed forces.

According to a spokesman for the German Defence Ministry, the German side views the Soviet military leader's visit as a favourable opportunity for further expansion of contacts between the armies of the two countries.

TASS Previews Mitterrand Visit

LD0505140591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1220 GMT 5 May 91

[By TASS commentator Aleksandr Konuzin]

[Text] Moscow, 5 May (TASS)—Francois Mitterrand, president of the French republic, will pay a short working visit to Moscow on Monday. The previous Franco-Soviet summit took place last October, however it has now become clear that the rapid fluctuations in international events call for a new collation of approaches.

The focal point of attention for the consultations between Francois Mitterrand and USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev will be the most important international problems, such as the common European process and the situation in the Middle East. First-hand information from Moscow should help Mitterrand make the necessary adjustments to French foreign policy which has undergone a significant evolution over the last few months.

The period that has passed since the signing of the Paris charter for a new Europe in November 1990 has shown that even such a far-sighted document is not capable of guaranteeing problem-free development of the common European process. In Moscow they believe, in particular, that different interpretations of the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe should not have been allowed to lead to crisis. Soviet diplomatic circles are convinced that there are realistic possibilities for finding a way out of the situation which has arisen, and relevant efforts are being made in this direction.

This theme will undoubtedly lead Soviet-French dialogue onto a broader discussion of the problems of the new system of European security. The security infrastructure of the CSCE process and the system of bilateral treaties—these are the elements from which the new construction of mutual guarantees will in time emerge, in the view of the experts.

It is likely that the French side will further clarify the idea of a European confederation which, as was noted in the course of previous meetings, is in keeping with the Soviet concept of a common European home. The impression is being created that in the coming months, France intends, on both the conceptual and organizational level, to give more concrete substance to its initiative. Any amplifications on this point will be received with interest in Moscow.

At the talks in Moscow, particular attention will be devoted to the Middle East center of tension. On the eve of the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs visit to the Middle East countries, the French will undoubtedly be interested in finding out what he is taking with him in his diplomatic baggage. Taking into account the two countries' stances on key components in finding a settlement in the Middle East—a common concept of the character and place for a world conference and the UN role—it is absolutely clear that the forthcoming consultations will be of mutual benefit. Both Moscow and Paris consider that the main task at this present stage is to start the process of talks and launch the mechanism for finding a peaceful settlement of Middle East problems.

One of the most important themes of the forthcoming talks between the presidents of the USSR and France will be the situation in the Soviet Union, which has in recent times become a vital factor in world politics. The French attentively follow the domestic upheavals in the USSR, trying to guess which partner they will have to deal with in the future.

As regards the development of bilateral relations, then they "are a little disappointing," it is noted in the Soviet capital. The numerous agreements concluded in recent years are not yielding the expected fruits.

The Moscow meeting has been called to make effective the Soviet-French treaty on accord and cooperation signed last October which, in its capacity of defining the principles of bilateral relations, placed trust, solidarity and cooperation in the forefront.

Gorbachev Meets News Corporation Head Murdoch

LD0505103191 Moscow TASS in English 1027 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev received Rupert Murdoch, the head of one of the world's major media companies and president of the News Corporation, in the Kremlin today.

Murdoch is currently in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the All-Union Copyright Agency.

It was expected that the course of restructuring in the Soviet Union and international issues would figure prominently during the meeting which began at noon.

UK's Hurd Cited on Need for USSR Stability

91UF0695B Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Apr 91 First Edition p 4

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent A. Lyutyy: "Whitehall's Alarm. Official London Is in Favor of Stability in the USSR"]

[Text] London—**Official London has again underscored at a very high level its interest in preserving the Soviet Union as a whole and viable state.**

Speaking at the opening of a four-day conference of young political figures from East and West on "The Future of Europe," Great Britain's Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd stated that it is not in the interests of Europe or the interests of the West to see the USSR "breaking down into a kaleidoscope of republics that will include those that will be weak and those that are being torn apart by contradictions inside their own borders." All of this, in Hurd's opinion, will create "the probability of continued chaos and weakness, which it is not advantageous for us to maintain."

It seems that these remarks were directed, among others, at those people in our country who want nothing more than to exhaust and dismember the USSR. The West is not interested in a weak and worn out, and thus potentially unpredictable, Soviet Union. That kind of development could lead to a slowing of the processes of integration in Europe.

This question arises: So what does London want to see in the USSR? In his speech, Hurd expressed the desire that mutual relations among the republics in a new and renewed USSR would be built "on agreement, not commands and force." He remained silent with respect to how far this is met by the formula for the new Union treaty. True, Hurd did place the Baltic republics in a special category, stressing once again that London has always regarded their annexation to the USSR in 1940 as unlawful.

London, the head of the Foreign Office said, would like to see the USSR "reformed" on the economic plane and moving toward the market. The extent to which this is accomplished will determine further aid for the USSR both from Britain and from the European Community in general.

At the same time Hurd perhaps for the first time recognized the limited nature of the effect that the West can have on our situation. Emphasizing that a "virtual daily struggle is now going on" between opponents and supporters of reform, a struggle "whose outcome we do not know," the minister said this: "We should not delude ourselves that we possess any kind of decisive weight that could determine the outcome of the struggle. The answers will be found inside the borders of the USSR."

What is now going on in the Soviet Union is causing some concern both in Whitehall and throughout Britain in general. The local mass media are calling this week one of the most difficult for M.S. Gorbachev; what they have in mind is the attempts by the "Soyuz" group of deputies to have an extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies convened, and the probability of sharp debates expected at the upcoming party plenum.

Opinions have appeared in the British press that Gorbachev needs the support of the democrats now as he never has before, including those who have rejected the president, reproaching him for "leaning toward the conservatives." It is the opinion of the English press that all the healthy forces in society that favor centrist or left-centrist positions are obligated to help Gorbachev.

Virtually every day the press is publishing materials on the state of the Soviet economy that remind one of reports of new losses on the front line. The statement issued by an unnamed, highly placed representative of the International Monetary Fund on the need for radical revamping of the entire structure of the Soviet economy is being extensively cited. He gave it to be understood that delay with this will slow down the flow of capital investments from businessmen in the West. "Not one country in the world is now prepared to invest money in a rotten structure;" these are the words of the IMF official that the newspapers are quoting.

In his speech at the "The Future of Europe" conference, Douglas Hurd reasonably noted that the path of economic reform in the Soviet Union cannot be "the same as in Czechoslovakia, Poland, or Hungary." At the same time attention must be directed to the fact that in London they are constantly holding up those countries as an example of decisiveness and boldness in restructuring the economy.

Speaking at the same conference, Secretary for Trade and Industry John Redwood also stated directly that "Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia are bold countries. They understand that there is no way back." True, he noted, the temporary difficulties being experienced by those states have turned out to be more acute than was expected. "Even those who warned that there would be no magic recipe," Redwood said, "have surely been discountenanced when they see the decline in production, the loss of work places, and the sharp price increases."

Political & Social

Gorbachev, Rupert Murdoch Discuss Perestroyka

CM0605105991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May Second Edition pp 1,6

[Text] Rupert Murdoch, president of the very large international mass media firm News Corporation, who is currently in Moscow on business, has been received by the USSR president. Their conversation naturally started with the role of the "Fourth Estate"—the mass media, at such a complex moment in history.

Rupert Murdoch lamented the fact that it is now very difficult to follow events in the USSR by reading the Soviet press: it is too confusing and contradictory. Mikhail Gorbachev reacted by saying that in reality what was happening in the USSR demands thought and that the truth cannot be found in a flash. It could be said that our press is choking on the surplus oxygen which it has suddenly received. But the contradictions in the press also stem from the scale of the changes. Over six years perestroyka has gone through several phases: from the unfettered, wonderful soaring of the initial openness when the whole of society was demonstrating "brotherly love", to a very acute crisis when in fact people have had to bid farewell to all that they had become accustomed to over many long years. The most "interesting" period began when people's deepest interests were affected. We are crossing a peak between one state in society and another. And people are in a fever, they are anxious about what will come of it all, where it will all end, and whether things will end up even worse than they were before. That is the source of the tension and of all kinds of outbreaks of trouble and clashes.

Nobody can predict exactly what will happen as a result of perestroyka. But it would be superficial and unproductive to expect that it should be a "copy" of experience elsewhere. Making use of such experience is another matter... It would be dangerous for international poicy if the success of perestroyka were to be judged according to how close it had brought Soviet society to some other way of life. A multiethnic, multilingual country that has a unique history and special features all its own has its own path to follow, although we have recognized that common human values are a priority and the achievements of world civilization are our guide.

Elements of chaos are also inevitable when any country turns to a completely new situation, and all the more so for one like ours. If one simply suppresses these things, then that is a return to the past. And that means ruin. A final choice has been made and movement can only be forwards. The task of politics now is to ensure that the elements of chaos do not reach catastrophic dimensions. The time we are going through brings with it enormous opportunity and potential, but also enormous risk. And it is no coincidence that the joint statement by the president and the leaders of nine republics came into being at precisely that kind of moment. At its foundation there is an understanding of the real danger of the disintegration of the state and the collapse of the economy. Its purpose is to ensure conditions for the continuation of the deep reforms, to contain the processes within the framework of democracy and the reform, and to prevent social collapse.

And it is very important that the overseas public, and hence the mass media in the first place, should understand correctly what is really taking place and not draw hasty conclusions about "a change of course" each time the Soviet leadership takes a new step. It is difficult to foresee how many more surprises life will bring, and how many we, for our part, will bring to life. But the general political choice is not changing. And that says it all.

A correct appraisal of all of this depends a great deal on world politics, too, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed more than once during the conversation.

And, inasmuch as Soviet-American relations are its cornerstone, understanding by the United States of what is happening is of special significance.

[TASS in Russian on 5 May at 1550 GMT adds: The president shared with his conversation partner unrest at the signs that are manifesting themselves of a correction in the United States of the attitude toward the USSR. This is reflected not only in statements, but also in certain steps of an economic and political nature.] One must constantly think of the special value of relations between two such states and not subject them to unncessary trials, particularly at such a crucial time. They have already given much that is positive to the world, and they demand for themselves a careful attitude, that they be filled with new content, and that there be progress. If what has been gained here at the end of the term of the preceding administration and during the period of George Bush's presidency is undermined, the world will once again plunge into the abyss of a "cold" or "semi-cold" war—in any event into an atmosphere of political "dampness" such as will exert a very bad influence on the health of all international life.

To Rupert Murdoch's question concerning a meeting between the president's of the USSR and the United States, Mikhail Gorbachev replied that for his part, nothing had changed here. In general he feels that Soviet-American summit meetings should become regular and free from the gloss of sensation, as is already happening to a significant degree with meetings between the leaders of European states. [TASS adds: And if the conviction remains intact in Washington that the planned meeting of the two presidents is necessary not only for the USSR but also the United States, then one has to proceed calmly and confidently toward it.]

Mikhail Gorbachev confirmed his high appraisal of the position of George Bush with respect to the accords that had been reached between them.

Taking part were N.N. Chetverikov, chairman of the All-Union Copyright Agency; and R. Pastor and E. Knight, vice presidents of News Corporation.

Pavlov Receives Murdoch

LD0305174991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1510 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 3 May (TASS)—Rupert Murdoch, president of News Corporation, head of one of the world's largest mass information concerns, is visiting the USSR at the invitation of the All-Union Agency for Authors' Rights [VAAP].

He was received today by USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, who, in answering the guest's questions, has informed him about the process of reforms in our country and the program of the USSR Cabinet of Minister for getting the economy out of crisis. Possibilities for the concern's cooperation with Soviet organizations were discussed.

N. Chetverikov, chairman of the VAAP board, and Y. Mikhailov, head of the USSR prime minister's news service, took part in the businesslike and frank conversations.

Gorbachev Chairs Conference on Soldiers' Injuries

LD0505183391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 May (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev held a conference in the Kremlin today at which the results of the work of a commission checking the causes of deaths and injuries among servicemen in peacetime were heard. It was set up by a decree of the president in November of last year.

The USSR president recommended that the working out of legislative acts aimed at providing legal and social protection for servicemen on compulsory military service and of draft laws in the field of military reform in the USSR should be accelerated. It has been deemed necessary to set up a public and state body to monitor observance of the rights of servicemen while they are performing their full-time military service.

Further on Conference

["Conference With USSR President"]

CM0605105591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev chaired a meeting in the Kremlin on 5 May which discussed the questions of the fulfillment of the decree of the USSR president of 15 November 1990 on measures to implement the proposals of the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers.

It discussed the results of the activity of the special commission set up by the presidential decree to check the objectivity and completeness of the investigations into the deaths and injuries of troops and military construction troops, and heard the heads of a number of ministries and departments report on the fulfillment of the tasks entrusted to them on these questions by the USSR president.

The USSR president demanded that all officials unswervingly and exhaustively implement the 15 November 1990 decree. A recommendation was made to accelerate the preparation of legislation aimed at the legal and social protection of troops performing their military service, and also draft laws on military reform in our country.

It was deemed essential to create a social and state body to monitor the observance of the rights of troops doing their active military service.

The meeting was attended by Comrades Lukyanov, Pugo, Lushchikov, Trubin, and heads of the USSR Ministry of Defense and of the commission for investigating the deaths and injuries of soldiers in peace time, and representatives of the Council of Soldiers' Parents.

Cabinet of Ministers Presidium Holds Meeting

LD0305170191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1350 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] I said at the beginning of the News Panorama about 50 minutes ago that despite today being a day of rest, the Presidium has been wide awake—I have in mind the Presidium of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers. Its meeting took place today in Moscow. It examined the preliminary results of the joint work with the republics on fleshing out the government program for overcoming the crisis. Details will be provided over the telephone by correspondent Valeriy Kiosa.

[Kiosa] This meeting began today with a report by USSR Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov. He stressed that many main provisions of the government program had been supported by the representatives of the republics and it is expected that the absolute majority of the documents necessary for the implementation of this program will be ready as early as in May. I will note at once that taking part in the joint group were representatives of all republics.

The deputy prime minister reported that a number of inter-republican agreements, also including social programs which will undoubtedly be fulfilled, are now being drawn up.

As regards all other programs, they must be frozen inasmuch as the financial possibilities do not permit realizing them. And it will be possible to do something under these programs only if additional funds become available.

Essentially what we are talking about here is the realization, at long last, of the oft-repeated slogan 'Live according to one's means.' By the way, this applies to both the republics and the Cabinet of Ministers itself.

Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov also reported that on the whole an accord has been reached with the republics on the list of goods which are to be exempted from the five-percent sales tax.

In accordance with the appreciable expansion of the republics' powers, certain corrections have been introduced into the draft decree regarding the minimum consumer budget and the draft law on the indexation of the population's income. These two documents are now also being discussed in the republics.

However, at today's meeting the main attention was given to the resolution of those problems for which it is still not possible, unfortunately, to find solutions. This is, first of all, how to carry out privatization and how to draw up the emergency budget for the second quarter.

I remind you that the Cabinet of Ministers believes that it is necessary for our economy today not to share property among the republics, the Union, the regions, which may take a long time and be very painful, but to carry out as quickly as possible the privatization of trade, the service sphere, small enterprises, and the conversion of large works into join-stock companies. Many republics, for instance the Ukraine and Russia, insist that everything that is situated on their territory belongs exclusively to them and that is why, initially, one must, nevertheless, carry out a division of property and then the republics themselves will decide what to do with their enterprises.

As regards budget, and in a wider context financial problems, here many republics—Belorussia, the Ukraine, and Russia—advocate the lifting all restrictions from the consumption fund of enterprises. In Shcherbakov's view, this is related to the fact that the social programs that have already been adopted in the republics are not backed up with finances. That is why it is proposed that the enterprises themselves be mainly concerned with carrying them out. According to the calculations of the Cabinet of Ministers, however, in this case before the end of the year, another 150 billion rubles [R] will hit us—the personal market. And then it will no longer be possible to speak of the economy getting out of the crisis and of having an economy at all itself.

That is why the government advocates—along with the trade unions—an accord to that effect has been reached in principle to link the increase in wages with increased production.

A great deal will still have to be resolved as regards the matter for compensations in connection with the increase in prices. For instance, today it was said that it remains to be determined what is to be done with the increase in prices in municipal transportation and for many municipal services. This rise was carried out by local soviets even though the government proposals for price reforms did not provide for that. And thus prices rose by another R40 billion which was not incorporated in the compensations. Briefly, there are still many problems and, as a matter of fact, one must not hope that they will easily resolved. However, the Cabinet of Ministers proceeds from the fact that this must not delay the realization of the entire program. That is why it is being proposed to include these questions in individual inter-republican agreements and to start fulfilling without delay the entire government program, first and foremost in terms of restoring proprietors in the country.

And, finally, the main questions—what more will happen? It was reported today that it is expected that on 12 May the representatives of the republics will again arrive in Moscow and negotiations will resume, which is to permit to prepare in the course of two-three days for signing an inter-republican agreement on the fulfilment of a joint anticrisis program.

More on 3 May Cabinet Session

PM0405200791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by TASS observers B. Grishchenko and B. Shestakov: "Light at the End of the Tunnel? From a USSR Cabinet of Ministers Session"]

[Text] One of the first decisive steps taken by the new Cabinet of Ministers was to move to the former USSR Gosstroy [State Committee for Construction Affairs] building on Pushkin Street. On 3 May Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov chaired what was probably one of the last sessions of the Union Government to be held inside the Kremlin. Its previous residence will henceforth house the USSR president's staff.

There was something symbolic about the leave-taking with the Oval Room in which Soviet Government sessions have been held for over 70 years. This is because both the package of urgent measures making up the anticrisis program and the action plan to implement the statement by the "Ten"—the subject of the Cabinet discussion—envisage taking leave of the old command methods of management and regrouping ahead of a radical breakthrough to a renewed Union, cooperation by all social and political movements, and a market economy.

Essentially both main questions were examined at the same time because these documents set the shared objective of stabilizing the alarming socioeconomic situation in the country and clearing the way for further reforms.

Deputy Prime Minister V.I. Shcherbakov, who presented a report, described the progress of the joint work being done with the republics on the Cabinet's anticrisis program. The intensive work to coordinate mutual interests and flesh out the general provisions, the speaker said, will continue after the celebrations in Morozovka near Moscow in which trade union representatives and people's deputies will be participating. It is planned that the final text will be examined at an enlarged session of the Union Government on 15 May and submitted to the leaders of the country and the republics for signing. Those who decide not to sign the Union Treaty will be able to operate in the USSR's unified economic space with the rights of a foreign state.

Far from all the disputed questions have yet been resolved. There are differences over the state order system and the shape of consumption funds. A worrying trend is that individual republics' legislatures and governments, courting popularity, are putting in "orders" for which there are no substantial material resources. Furthermore, prices for goods and services not specified in Cabinet decisions have been increased in a number of regions, which is causing additional social tension.

The treasury is short of money, and one of the ways to solve the problem is the immediate removal of property from state control. The benefits are manyfold: The budget would receive additional revenue and, furthermore, owners would be striking against themselves. It is proposed, incidentally, that excise duties be imposed on some nonessentials and luxury items and the proceeds channeled direct into the funds for the social protection of the population.

For the information of some of the present cabinet's critics: Its leaders regard the removal of state controls and privatization as the most important instrument of economic renewal. Admittedly the specific mechanism for changing property relationships is not yet clear and there are differing viewpoints on the possibility of allowing in foreign capital. But the foundation of the future economy is quite definitely being built on market principles. And measures of a different order—the introduction of special arrangements in basic industries and consumer goods production—are merely an essential retreat which will help in building up resources for decisive changes. USSR Finance Minister V.Ye. Orlov and Russian First Deputy Premier O.I. Lobov talked about alarming facts and trends. But they too recognized that the joint statement by the USSR president and the leaders of nine union republics represents a kind of "light at the end of the tunnel" making it possible to hope for favorable changes.

USSR First Deputy Prime Minister V.Kh. Doguzhiyev spoke in calm and measures terms about the prospects for an upsurge in production. Of the three factors in the slump that has occurred, in his view, the strike wave has fallen away and the "war of laws" can be ended by precisely delineating the powers of the Union and the republics. Maybe the only thing which it will be difficult to offset is the sharp reduction in imports—the reason why many production facilities are standing idle. But on the whole the losses of recent months can and must be made up by the end of the year. This, incidentally, was also confirmed by Deputy Premier L.D. Ryabev, who heads the fuel and energy complex, and his colleague F.P. Senko, who described the course of the sowing campaign.

This vast country, rich in resources and the people's industriousness, has all it needs to clamber out of the difficult situation. But, the speakers stressed, we can only do this together, setting aside needless ambition and parochial interest. The further decentralization of ownership and of the decisionmaking process, consideration for each other's needs, the strengthening of incentives for productive labor through the creation of a true proprietor of material assets—that is the road that will lead us "to the temple."

...Even in these festive days, when the country has cast aside its daily worries and is taking a well-earned rest, painstaking work continues in government. The decisions that are being formulated jointly and the constantly honed phrases of the documents will form the basis of the future long-awaited changes. Changes for the better, we fervently hope!

Memorial Group Protests in Moscow

LD0505214991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2000 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] This evening the Memorial Society picketed the center of Moscow, and there has been a day in memory of Ostashvili, organized by the Pamyat Society. Over to our correspondents Andrey Pishchayev and Igor Bochegov:

[Pishchayev] I must admit, I was a bit surprised to see a reinforced militia unit in the center of Moscow. Again Red Square was surrounded by imperturbable law enforcers and barriers. People were being allowed out, but not in. Why? It turned out that the Memorial legal defense society intended to picket there and hold a protest watch on Red Square. As I was informed by the organizers of the picketing, it was to attract the public's attention to events in Nagorno-Karabakh, and in the villages of Martunashen and Getashen in Khanlarskiy rayon in Azerbaijan, which have become sadly famous in the last few days. As everyone knows, the enforced deportation of inhabitants of Armenian nationality is under way in those villages. Those taking part in the picketing—some 120-150 people had gathered right next to Red Square, near the Lenin Museum—held up banners and placards to the proprietory television cameras. Here are just a few of them: Russian soldier, you are not a pillager, you are not a murderer; End the bloodshed, start talks; Allow independent observers into the conflict zone.

But the Moscow soviet did not give permits to those taking part in the picketing, and did not allow them into Red Square. Why? I asked this question of Mikhail Pechura, member of the working collegium of Memorial responsible for the picketing.

[Begin Pechura recording] We received a refusal by phone, so we do not have a complete guarantee that our request reached the authorities. The respected official who phoned, Vasiliy Ivanovich Lebedev, promised to give an answer. When I phoned him at about 1400, he said that the leadership is of the opinion to advise us against holding, that is to say it refuses us permission to hold this action because it could influence relations between the Armenian and Azeri communities in Moscow. I tried to learn the surname of the person in the leadership who gave the refusal, but all I heard was: The leadership is of the opinion. [end recording]

[Pishchayev] So there is almost a detective story for you. And two (?hours) ago there was a memorial ceremony for Ostashvili on Red Square. [passage indistinct]

[Bochegov] Those are the shouts that I was greeted with by those who had gathered today at the monument to the butcher Sverdlov—those are their words: activists of the Pamyat society. There were just over 20 people gathered there. A very colorful person in a white sweater, with the slogan: [words indistinct] you are an accomplice of Tel Aviv, and [word indistinct] de-Zionisation, declared that Konstantin Smirnov-Ostashvili did not commit suicide in prison, but was murdered by the Zionists. He also called for Ostashvili's memory to be honored by a minute of silence. If anyone did not want to remove his hat during that minute, they tried to pull it off by force.

(?Actually) the whole event took place with endless discussions with passers-by in somewhat high tones. [passage indistinct]

It is a pity that they would not let me record these worrying dialogues. Yes, this time, fortunately, everything passed without fighting, but with such events there is no guarantee of this at all.

Further on Alleged Presidents' Document

LD0305140191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] What does the weekly KOMMERSANT offer for our delectation today?

As has become known from unofficial but reliable sources, during the meeting of presidents at the dacha at Novoye Ogarevo, not just one document was signed, but at least two. We know all about the first one. The second document signed by all the participants of the meeting, including the Union president—what is known as the memorandum—contains a whole range of specific undertakings given by Gorbachev to the representatives of the republics.

This document is confidential, and was not made public after the meeting. But KOMMERSANT managed to obtain from the same source quite a detailed account of the memorandum. Here are its main theses:

Gorbachev acknowledged the status of sovereign states for the Union republics, and guaranteed that there would be no interference by the Center in their internal affairs.

The president also acknowledged the priority of republican legislation over Union legislation with regard to all questions concerning the republics' internal affairs. In their turn, the republics guaranteed strict observation of Union laws in spheres not covered by republican legislation.

The date for the signing of the Union treaty is postponed from May-June to July this year—after the election of the president of Russia. Relations with republics which do not sign the Union treaty will in all respects be constructed exactly as with foreign states. After the signing of the Union treaty and the adoption of the new constitution, there will be elections for a new composition of the central legislative bodies and presidential elections.

There will be a distribution of property between the Center and the republics. The republics will finally receive the independent right to dispose of the foreign currency earned on their territory. There will be a stage by stage abolition of the 5 percent sales tax.

Within one week, Gorbachev will present information on the Union's foreign debt to the nine leaders who took part in the talks.

Officially, the trip to the dacha ended with the publication in the newspapers of the joint statement on urgent measures to stabilize the situation in the country and overcome the crisis. Boris Yeltsin, speaking on 25 April at a closed meeting of the Russian Supreme Soviet, reported that the talks lasted nine and one-half hours and that the initial variant of the agreement proposed by Gorbachev was redrafted by 80 percent. According to Yeltsin, this was the first time Gorbachev spoke in a human manner. In other words, Mikhail Sergeyevich, after months of hestiation and mistakes, found within himself the strength to overcome the boundary which is out of reach to the majority of politicians—the barrier of a sensible division of power.

It is important to note that the initiative for the meeting came from the Union president himself. This sounds very optimistic. I hope that in the near future we will see how it is implemented in practice.

PRAVDA Festival Held in Moscow 3-4 May

Frolov Opens Festival

PM0305211591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 91 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Nikolay Kozhanov report: "Strength in Truth and Accord"]

[Excerpts] Yesterday, just like a year ago, tens of thousands of Muscovites and visitors to the capital thronged the paths and avenues and wandered through the pavilions of the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements where PRAVDA is a holding its second festival. That this is the second festival means it is no longer a one-off event but signifies the establishment of a tradition, as M.S. Gorbachev noted in his greetings to the participants in and organizers of the festival. And the fact that this tradition is being born at such a difficult time for the country is yet further evidence of people's urgent need both for objective and comprehensive information and for reader-newspaper feedback—ordinary, spontaneous human contact at all levels. [passage omitted]

The opening of the festival was addressed by I.T. Frolov, chief editor of PRAVDA and a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

"You have come today to the festival of a publication which is 79 years old in two days' time. One of the country's oldest newspapers, PRAVDA has been through the entire history of the Communist movement in Russia. It has seen everything in its time but our newspaper's life has always been bound up with that of the state and the party. M.S. Gorbachev in his message to the organizers of and participants in the festival stressed, in my view, two most important thoughts. The first is that our festival should be a place for keen discussions on our society's most important problems. The second is that this should serve consolidation."

V.A. Ivashko, A.N. Girenko, A.S. Dzasokhov, P.K. Luchinskiy, G.V. Semenova, Ye.S. Stroyev, and Yu.A. Prokofyev took part in the festival.

Frolov Views Plans, Goals

LD0405121491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 3 May 91

["Exclusive" interview with PRAVDA Editor-in-Chief Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov by correspondent Irina Kalinovskaya on 3 May; place not given—recorded]

[Text] The beginning of May is traditionally a time of festivals, meaning 1 May and Victory Day, but sometimes many people forget that Press Day is also marked in the interval between those festivals. Press Day is traditionally marked in our country on 5 May. It was on 5 May 1912 that Vladimir Ilyich Lenin organized the newspaper PRAVDA. That newspaper's festival began at the USSR Exhibition of the Achievements of the National Economy today. Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov, who is editor-in-chief of PRAVDA, has given an exclusive interview to Radio Rossii. Correspondent Irina Kalinovskaya spoke to him.

[Begin recording] [Kalinovskaya] Ivan Timofeyevich, please tell us about your festival today.

[Frolov] I feel that, if we are to judge by the beginning, it is succeeding as an event in which there are both arguments and discussions. There are constructive arguments. But the festival is not the most important thing. A lot of people have come here to rest and relax a little. We have many interesting groups and ensembles participating, which will perform everywhere.

Perhaps in our very troubled and adverse time it is not a bad thing that from time to time we organize such festivals for ourselves, with the full understanding that we are having a hard time. Does this mean that we should spend all our time brooding about it?

[Kalinovskaya] Ivan Timofeyevich, during the years of stagnation PRAVDA was one of the most widely read newspapers. It was a tradition to subscribe to PRAVDA. Now that we are living under a market economy, the newspaper's circulation is declining. How do you explain this, and what does your newspaper's collective want to undertake in order to raise the newspaper's prestige?

[Frolov] I do not know to what extent it was the most widely read, but evidently this is in accordance with reality because a system under which, if you were a party member or some sort of functionary, or simply some class-conscious as they called it then—a worker—if you had not read something in PRAVDA, others might ask you or even reproach you, saying: How come you have not read the decision, or a speech, or an editorial? Now everything is much simpler. PRAVDA is simply a newspaper. Some people might be interested in it, others not. There is no compulsion to subscribe. We are also taking into account that there is a negative reaction in society to this newspaper, which used to have a rather unattractive image. Of course, surmounting this is very hard work. Many of our journalists are desperate. Many are even leaving believing that a certain train of ill will is attached to this newspaper. I think that if we work normally and surmount ideas in our conscience—because in some cases among us there are still those are working in accordance with the old thinking—then gradually this oldest newspaper of ours will become more interesting. This will be a party newspaper, a Communist one. No one is trying to abandon it. At the same itme, it will be a popular newspaper widely read by many, was the case when PRAVDA was new. In 1912 PRAVDA was a daily workers' newspaper. It aimed at a broad readership.

I think, in the end, all this will come to pass. It will come to pass under the conditions of pluralism, of a multiparty system, and of the presence of a large quantity of the most varied newspapers, with different orientations. This newspaper will exist, in a certain sense, with its own unique readership, with its own face. This will please some people, but others will not be pleased. What is to be done? That is what life is like. We do not intend to do anything in order to simply foist our newspaper on anyone, but we do not want to sit with arms folded either. We are trying to make the newspaper different and are, at the same time, propagandizing it. That is why we have organized a festival—in order to attract the attention of the wider public to our newspaper.

[Kalinovskaya] Ahead lies a campaign for the election of the president.

[Frolov] Of the Russian president?

[Kalinovskaya] Yes. Which candidates will you support?

[Frolov] Of course we will take part. We will report on how this campaign proceeds. We will write about the candidates. I have already said, first and foremost—this is natural—our newspaper, as a Communist one, will support Communist deputies. But this does not mean that [words indistinct]. This does not mean that the non-Communist candidates will be rejected or we will somehow start slandering them. No. I am proposing nothing of the sort. If there is some disagreement among us as regards the candidates, we will report, we will conduct polemics, but it will be conducted in a way I would like, in a civilized, democratic way.

[Kalinovskaya] Thank you very much. [end recording]

Frolov on Circulation, Slogan

LD0305205191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1612 GMT 3 May 91

[Report by TASS correspondents Nikolay Veretin and Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow, 3 May (TASS)—Balloons with the word PRAVDA printed on them floating in the sky above the USSR Exhibition of Economic Achievements were a kind of landmark for hundreds of thousands of Muscovites and guests of the capital who headed for the exhibition this afternoon. The huge exhibition center in the northern part of the city is the venue for the traditional festival of this newspaper, which is the organ of the CPSU Central Committee. The festival is being held for the second time on the eve of the paper's birthday. The anniversary of its foundation on 5 May 1912 has become the professional holiday of Soviet journalists.

Mikhail Gorbachev, President of the USSR and General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, sent greetings to the festival participants and organizers on Thursday. Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, other party leaders, and representatives of the Soviet and foreign press attended the opening ceremony. The festival program includes discussions and conversations with politicians and public figures, scientists and journalists. Leftist publications in foreign countries are taking part in the event for the first time.

At a press conference this afternoon Ivan Frolov, the paper's editor-in-chief, stressed that PRAVDA journalists have changed their work style significantly. "We do not foist our views on anyone, we do not intend to lecture anybody", he said. Only debate and dialogue with readers can produce constructive results, the editor-in-chief noted.

In recent years the paper's circulation has fallen. Nevertheless it remains high. Currently the figure is 3.2 million copies. Ivan Frolov said that the need to work in new conditions has had an impact on the paper's financial results. Whereas before it always made a profit, the situation now is different: PRAVDA receives a subsidy, which the editor-in-chief termed credit. "We will repay it with interest", he declared.

Asked by journalists whether the paper intended to remove the slogan "Proletarians of the world, unite!" from its front page, Ivan Frolov stated: "I do not support superficial changes. In contemporary circumstances, of course, this slogan is regarded as a symbol. For us its retention is a mark of respect for tradition". At the same time he did not rule out the possibility of replacing the slogan some time in the future.

The festival will end tomorrow.

Ivashko on PRAVDA's Importance

PM0305212391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Comment on PRAVDA Festival opening 3 May in Moscow by V. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, under the General Heading "Visitors Comment"]

[Text] PRAVDA is a newspaper which stands alone in our country's history. It has always had an aspect of its own. And it must not lose it at such a complex time. A newspaper cannot stand back from life for a single minute, not by a single meter, so to speak. That is very hard to do today. But that is the task. Furthermore, in accordance with Leninist traditions the newspaper must go forward, giving people guidance in the social processes that are unfolding. At the same time PRAVDA cannot be untrue to itself to please the trends of the moment. It must not lose its respectability and must remain a newspaper which is known and loved by millions who measure their ideas about life and their attitude against it.

I think that this enormous and varied festival, which will clearly take more than the allotted two days to get to know, reflects the breadth of the newspaper's approach to the diverse phenomena of life. That is good. You cannot confine yourself to your own choices today but must go out to people, listen to them, and find in contact with them the main things for which we are all living and working.

Prokofyev on Democratization

PM0305213591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Comment on PRAVDA Festival opening 3 May in Moscow by Yu. Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Party City Committee, under the General Heading "Visitors Comment"]

[Text] This is a wonderful festival! Three times as many people have come to this year's festival as came to last year's. There are colleagues from Communist newspapers at the PRAVDA festival. This festival, I think, is becoming a good tradition.

I want to talk about the great social significance of the present festival. No matter how the situation in the country shapes up, people will not reject the festival. They need a break, an opportunity to relax, to stroll with their children, and to escape from pressing problems.

Generally speaking, in the conditions of the democratization of our life such forms of contact, leisure, and relaxation will clearly become increasingly varied. We must change our methods of work. And I think that we will soon have party cafes and clubs...

Look around: Life has changed dramatically and continues to change. And if we Communists want to keep our finger on life's pulse and keep in step with the people we must also change the methods of our work with people. Democratization, you will agree, does not come from the realms of theory. Democratization is our reality and the party cannot hope for success unless it takes that reality into account.

In short, the festival is a good and timely event with excellent prospects.

Papers Said 'Deceiving' Readers

LD0505220291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 5 May 91

[Nikolay Agayants commentary]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Press day: a festival, one would think. Yet the just over six years of our stormy and pretty confused perestroyka cause us to look at familiar things—including this day—differently. The changes that are taking place with difficulty in society, democratization and glasnost, can only gladden us. But alas, where journalists' affairs are concerned, it should be noted that glasnost is not yet freedom of speech and of the press; and this day which is being so festively marked by the official, mainly party, media is not the day of freedom of the press. It is rather, as the poet justly said, a festival with tears in our eyes, however much praise may be heaped on it by the none too truthful PRAVDA. Why? Well, first of all because with the exception of 10 or 20 printed publications in the USSR, the rest loyally preach the tedious ideology of the victory of socialism and of class hatred. They still resort to deceiving the trustful reader and to passing over in silence, or actually distorting the truth.

And Central Television: Lapin, Aksyonov, Nenashev, Kravchenko: four chairmen in the six years of perestroyka. They have been milestones on a great path—the path to nowhere. So there is absolutely no reason to make merry. And I think the Press Day congratulations that are so liberally sprinkled today across the pages of PRAVDA, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, GLASNOST, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, and MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA and the like are not very appropriate.

The birthday of the CPSU Central Committee organ is fine. But it's not an occasion for nationwide rejoicing and festivities. Let the ill-wishers indulge in abuse. Let the newspaper rivals be envious: The annual spring festival of PRAVDA has become a fact of our life. Bright, benevolent feelings toward the paper and toward the festival can be seen with the naked eye. This was written in an article entitled "The Festival That Is With Us," by PRAVDA correspondents Andreyev and Krivomazov. And that is fine. I say it sincerely, without abuse and without envy. Not that there's much to envy. Unfortunately, this paper remains just as conservative in the good old-fashioned style as it ever was. And its popularity, as can also be seen with the naked eye, has declined catastrophically in recent years.

But still I'm an optimist, and still I'm convinced that the time will come when freedom of speech will become in our country not an empty sound, but a reality; when there will be many good and various publications, which will, above all, be independent of anyone's diktat. And then perhaps the day of the festival will come, the real Press Day.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Praised

PM0605150191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[S. Oganyan article: "On Eve of Press Day"]

[Excerpt] On the eve of Press Day journalists met with their readers within the framework of the PRAVDA festival.

Devotees of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, mainly elderly people who disagree with the policy espoused by M. Gorbachev, B. Yeltsin, and G. Popov, gathered in the "Moscow" pavillion. The atmosphere in the hall was appreciably charged and there were frequent clashes of opinion. But by and large the visitors spoke with gratitude of the work performed by the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA collective, which, in the opinion of the gathering, is still the only newspaper today that brings people the truth. It was said at the meeting that, amidst the general lack of control on the part of the mass media, the newspaper upholds the people's interests and the ideas of patriotism and combating Zionism. A list of signatures backing the nomination of A. Sergeyev as candidate for Russian president did the rounds. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA Report Contested

PM0605152191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 May 91 First Edition p 1

[S. Kosterin report: "Echo of Festival. Reader Takes Initiative"]

[Text] We SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA journalists had a splendid opportunity to talk directly with readers at the PRAVDA festival 3-4 May. The day before yesterday a sizable audience gathered in the "Moscow" pavillion at the Exhibition of National Economic Achievements.

Admittedly, we did not entirely succeed in keeping to the plan for the meeting: first talking about ourselves, about what we are working on, and what readers will see in future editions. It was more important for people gathered in the hall to voice their own opinions.

The speakers shared the common hurt and an interest in how to extricate society from the crisis and achieve civil peace and accord, and how the mass media should operate in this situation. There were of course bitter speeches that recalled the passions generated at rallies and which were dictated by the acuteness of the current political situation. But the general tone of the discussion was constructive and good-natured.

In a commentary in yesterday's issue of PRAVDA headlined "On the Eve of Press Day" the writer S. Oganyan devoted a paragraph to the meeting between the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA editorial collective and their readers which somewhat perplexed the meeting's participants.

War and labor veteran Nikolay Fedoseyevich Shitikov, who spoke during the debate, dropped by the editorial office Here is his opinion:

"The writer of the PRAVDA commentary, S. Oganyan, claims that '...devotees of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA—mainly elderly people who disagree with the policy espoused by M.S. Gorbachev, B. Yeltsin, and G. Popov gathered' in the 'Moscow' pavillion. And that the atmosphere in the hall was charged and there were frequent clashes of opinion. I am surprised by the ironic subtext behind these words. He was inaccurate in giving the age of the audience—there were plenty of both young and middle-aged people in the room. But the main thing is that the writer seems to have equated the positions held by three different leaders. There was none of this in our speeches; they voiced disquiet over the future of Soviet power. We are after all witnessing how the opportunities for people's power are being restricted in some regions and cities."

Let me indicate another inaccuracy. The writer claims that there was talk of combating Zionism at the meeting. No one even mentioned this in the hall... Thanks for the invitation, as they say, but why these slipups?

Decline in Newspaper Sales Predicted

PM0305124191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 May 91 Moscow Edition p 3

[Interview under the "From Competent Sources" rubric with M. Nenashev, chairman of the State Committee for the Press, by G. Alimov; place and date not given; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction: "The Press Under the Market Guillotine"]

[Text] This is probably the first time the traditional professional holiday—Press Day—has prompted rather sad thoughts about the future of our periodical press. The press, which has done so much to advance in society the ideas of a market economy, may end up or, rather, has already ended up among the first in the grip of the most cruel reality: How to survive under conditions of escalating prices? This question arises particularly acutely once again ahead of the 1992 subscription campaign.

[Alimov] Mikhail Fedorovich, many, many periodicals have still not recovered from the shock of the fall subscription campaign. Newspaper circulations have fallen almost 30 percent. But this is not the limit of the misfortunes. Paper prices, in particular, are continuing to grow unchecked. What is to be done in this situation? Many publications are on the verge of financial collapse.

[Nenashev] A very acute question. The problem of fixed prices for newsprint has proved insoluble. The decision adopted in this regard by the USSR State Prices Committee is not working. I inquired, for example, how much the IZVESTIYA and PRAVDA Publishing Houses pay for a tonne of paper. Not 880-900 rubles [R], as was laid down, but R1,200-1,500. And if we speak of commercial prices, in the commodity exchanges one tonne sells for R5,000 or more. Compare: Only quite recently publishing houses were buying a tonne for R260.

I agree that the periodical press, particularly the state press, has ended up in a very serious position. Maybe even in a critical one. What now? What is to be done? I will say more: Quite a few shocks still lie in wait for the press. Prices might increase further, and not only for paper. It is possible to expect, as a result, a further drop in circulations. And let us state openly: The liquidation of many newspapers, even ones with a large circulation, is possible. I do not want to frighten anyone, but higher subscription rates are perfectly possible.

[Alimov] Is this your prognosis, or are there any specific calculations?

[Nenashev] The situation is as follows. For the time being we will not speak of the prices of paper or printing services. The USSR Ministry of Communications recently made a decision on a new subscription campaign. It will begin 1 August and run through 1 November. The Communications Ministry has approved new pay conditions for services relating to the distribution of periodicals in 1992, under which the cost of these services, according to certain estimates, will increase 150-200 percent. With what is the increased cost of this ministry's services connected? Above all, with the increased rates for railroad, air, and road transport. They have increased several times over. A whole number of new conditions has appeared in the agreement which publishing houses and distributors are to sign. The Communications Ministry intends, for example, to ascribe exclusively to publishing houses all losses from print runs not sold in retail trade and not to divide them equally, as was the case before. The distributors essentially want to absolve themselves of all responsibility for sales. Weeklies most of all and, in general, all newspapers sold only through the retail network can be expected to suffer because of this.

Another new circumstance. In concluding the agreement every periodical will now be obliged to make a payment into a so-called insurance fund—a current account of the Central Retail Subscription Agency—in line with the value of the monthly print run. The Communications

Ministry explains that this is being done so as to use these funds as compensation in the event of nonpublication, the closure of a publication, etc. Again a kind of diktat is manifested here.

[Alimov] We have only just freed ourselves from the diktat of agitprop, but here we are with new monopolists. Is this really to be tolerated?

[Nenashev] The director of the PRAVDA Publishing House has made the following calculations connected with the cost of the USSR Communications Ministry's "innovations" alone. He believes that, whereas delivery services previously amounted to something like 20-22 percent of the cost of a newspaper, they will now leap to 51-52 percent. Note: This is merely for delivery! And the paper, and printing services? And so it turns out that the average cost of a newspaper might once again increase 150-200 percent!

Of course, the monopoly of the Communications Ministry is manifested in all this. In proposing new terms, it realizes that no one else has at his disposal thousands of communications junctions and centers, thousands of special mail cars, and tens of thousands of vehicles. Therefore I am convinced that it is necessary to think about creating alternative structures, albeit at present at the level of the city, oblast, region...

[Alimov] Mikhail Fedorovich, the problems of which we are speaking go far beyond debit and credit and the financial difficulties of newspapers and journals. Does it not seem to you that the state, by putting periodicals in such an unenviable position, is, in point of fact, encroaching on the right of citizens to obtain and have information? You do not have to be a great economist to forecast that circulations will fall again and newspapers will simply become inaccessible to a very wide circle of people.

[Nenashev] The question is absolutely legitimate. It worries me too. Newspapers and journals are an unusual commodity and must not be treated as an ordinary product. The mass, public newspaper is an essential source of information. A normal person's day essentially begins by reading the newspaper, and it serves as a mechanism for realizing the right of every person to obtain information. This is a very serious thing. It concerns not just one person or group of people but the whole of society. A single print run of all newspapers today amounts to 205 million copies (last year it was 230 million). The single print run of journals is 155 million, compared with 170 million. Look what is happening: If you take the number of families as somewhere in the region of 70 million, then it will turn out that each family takes more than two newspapers and journals. Is it possible to proceed only from a consideration of a material nature, just like that, without consulting or fully weighing all the circumstances? Yes, the cost is great, but let us put the question differently: There are also other costs—social, political, and moral. Are they really worth nothing to society, and must we really not take this into account? And, finally, is glasnost really worth nothing now?

[Alimov] All the same, do you see specific ways out of the situation that has arisen?

[Nenashev] The USSR State Committee for the Press has discussed this problem jointly with the country's Journalists Union. And we intend to put the following question to the president. We are asking for an official government decision or, better still, a presidential decree to finally firmly establish fixed prices for paper. There must be total clarity here. Fixed prices must be laid down for services. If the press really fulfills very important social functions in society, then it must be subsidized to a certain extent by the state. The state must not be indifferent to ensuring citizens' rights to information and must protect and pay for this right, since the realization of this right demands great expenditure. In this connection we believe that it is necessary to define a policy of state protectionism, i.e. to think about how to change the tax system and what conditions to create for the periodical press so that it can withstand the cruel blows of market relations. Under our country's conditions the press is an amazingly lucrative matter. On the whole, its commodity turnover amounts to almost R5 billion [sentence as published]. We say: Let us give up some part, some percentage of this R5 billion to the newspapers, journals, and publishing houses.

However, when I speak of a policy of protectionism and state subsidies for realizing the citizens' right to information, this is nothing new for civilized countries. According to the materials at our disposal, world practice is as follows: In the majority of countries the state subsidizes all the transportation and aviation costs of the periodical press. And this is what is most interesting: The press has a very preferential tax system. In Europe, again in the majority of countries, deductions into the budget amount to a maximum 10 percent.

We are also asking for a corresponding decree to instruct the Cabinet of Ministers to draw up a program of material and technical backup for the press. There was a lot of talk about this. And there were Supreme Soviet assignments in connection with the adoption of the Law on the Press. Almost a year has passed, and there is no program. The situation is extremely grave now: Printing machine building, the chemical industry, the development of paper production—all these sectors are in a critical state. Printing capacities will soon begin collapsing, and we are no longer obtaining new equipment from the GDR and Czechoslovakia, as used to be the case.

[Alimov] Mikhail Fedorovich, your committee also represents the state and is also responsible to society...

[Nenashev] We are prepared to take on questions, particularly after the committee has been transformed into the Ministry for the Press and Information, of coordinating the activities of the periodical press and implementing a policy of protectionism. I believe that this must be tackled precisely by this ministry, as well as questions of tax rates, profits, and prices. Newspapers and journals must not be left one on one with the market, and it is important, all the same, for them to have their own advocate. But if our ministry remains without rights, there will be no point in its existence.

New Newspaper Set To Publish

LD0505042791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2100 GMT 4 May 91

[Text] The 5th of May is Press Day. More new newspapers and journals are getting mass circulation of late. This is the new situation that has come to us during the years of perestroyka.

The first edition of the newspaper PROLETARIY [PROLETARIAT] will come out in the next few days. It is published by the Marxist Workers Party. The edition will contain information on the workers movement, the social and economic situation in the country, and other materials.

TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press for 4 May

LD0405060691 Moscow TASS in English 0550 GMT 4 May 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—PRAVDA and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (the only newspapers published today) inform about the consequences of the earthquake in Georgia and publish Boris Yeltsin's decree "on changing management conditions at enterprises of the coal and other basic industries on the territory of the Russian Federation".

The document establishes, in particular, that enterprises of the coal and other basic industries which come under the jurisdiction of Russian Federation state bodies on the decision of their labour collectives receive full economic independence, including choosing the form of ownership and economic management, in accordance with the Russian Federation legislation.

The second festival of the newspaper PRAVDA opened on the grounds of the exhibition of economic achievements. The newspaper provides detailed coverage of the festival, publishes pictures and speeches by Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and guests.

Representatives of fraternal newspapers from 20 countries of the world are attending the festival.

PRAVDA tells about Aleksandr Dzasokhov's trip to the Ryazan region, his numerous meetings with the representatives of trade union, veterans' and youth organisations.

The newspaper also published the text of greetings of the CPSU Central Committee to the 14th congress of the Swiss Labour Party and Mikhail Gorbachev's greetings to Polish people on the occasion of Poland's national holiday—the 200th anniversary of the constitution.

Both newspapers carry reports about Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov's official visit to China.

Retired Colonel-General Yuriy Mamsurov, former deputy minister of civil aviation, writes in PRAVDA about the crisis of the country's air transport system. Mamsurov blames decades of the monopoly of one customer and one contractor: Aeroflot and the Aviation Industry Ministry, for the crisis.

"It is necessary that the country have several truly independent companies," he writes.

PRAVDA publishes archive documents indicating that leaders of the Ukrainian Nationalist Organisation were agents of Nazi secret services, that Bandera was not only an accomplice of Fascists but also collaborated with secret services as an agent.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes that Soviet Defence Minister Marshal Dmitriy Yazov cited a large group of Soviet Army servicemen for their fruitful work in military mass media, on the occasion of the press day on May 5.

Newspapers comment on the complex situation in the Persian Gulf and the election campaign in India. PRAVDA writes in a dispatch from Belgrade that the inter-ethnic conflict in Yugoslavia entered the dramatic phase. The same newspaper writes about the initialling of documents on internal political settlement in Angola.

TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press for 5 May

LD0505110191 Moscow TASS in English 1035 GMT 5 May 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—Today's PRAVDA, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and other newspapers publish articles, reports and interviews devoted to Press Day, a professional holiday marked in the Soviet Union today. They note that the mass media plays an important role in the life of Soviet society.

PRAVDA publishes an interview with Politburo member, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Petu Luchinskiy, devoted to the development of Soviet mass media, the role and work of party publications in current conditions.

PRAVDA also carries detailed reports on the PRAVDA festival, which ended at the USSR Economic Achievements Exhibition, on Saturday. The newspaper carries several interviews with Soviet and foreign guests of the festival, as well as a report on the get-together of journalists with their readers, arranged during the festival.

The newspaper says that the PRAVDA festival was attended by delegations from several foreign newspapers. "Thousands of festival participants visited the pavilion where these delegations arranged their stands, featuring photographs of life in their countries, and readily bought souvenirs there. They are sure to remember for long the video-recorded performances of foreign variety stars shown in this pavilion," PRAVDA says.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA marked Press Day by publishing letters from its readers. They take up the newspaper's entire third page. The letters contain recommendations on how the newspaper could be improved and made more interesting.

Today's TRUD carries a commentary devoted to problems confronting Soviet mass media today and the prospects of glasnost. Under the caption "Highly Risky Profession", TRUD publishes an article by analyst Yevgeniy Shulyukin. It is devoted to problems of the foreign press.

The newspapers continue highlighting the consequences of the earthquake in Transcaucasia, primarily in Georgia, and the efforts exerted to overcome them. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, For instance, informs readers about the scope of the natural calamity. It says that more than 150 villages and towns were damaged by the earthquake in Georgia alone. Some 100 people have perished according to far from complete data. Aid is being rushed to the calamity area from various republics and regions of the country, as well as from abroad.

The press spotlights the aggravation of the situation on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan. According to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, "fire is being exchanged along the entire border line between the two republics". Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan and Commander of Soviet Interior Troops Colonel-General Yuriy Shatalin express their views on these events in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. The newspaper also publishes the view of the Azerbaijanian AZERINFORM news agency on this score.

PRAVDA publishes a commentary on the recently adopted USSR Railway Transport Law. It notes, specifically, that the adoption of this law contributes to the restoration of disrupted economic ties and overcoming the protracted economic crisis".

In its "economics and politics" section PRAVDA carries a report by its special correspondent Yuriy Medvedev, devoted to the social problems of Vorkuta miners.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA features an article by writer Eduard Limonov, who lives in France. The author gives his own interpretation to the socio-political events now occurring in the Soviet Union.

TRUD describes the relationships between emigres from the USSR, arriving in Israel, and the local population.

TASS Reviews Central Press for 6 May

LD0605072991 Moscow TASS in English 0703 GMT 6 May 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 6 TASS—PRAVDA reports today that Mikhail Gorbachev on Sunday met a delegation from the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party led by Michio Watanabe. The Soviet leader stressed that "the arrival of this prestigeous delegation shortly after the summit means that the Soviet-Japanese dialogue continues".

The same newspaper writes that later on Sunday the Soviet president received news corporation president Rupert Murdoch, who is now on a visit in Moscow. During the meeting Gorbachev pointed to the importance of how the American people understand developments in the USSR.

Asked by Murdoch about a Soviet-American summit, Gorbachev replied that "nothing has changed in this respect on his part". The president believes that Soviet-American summits should be regular.

Newspapers write that the situation near the Armenian-Azerbaijani border and in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region has seriously deteriorated. The TRUD newspaper notes in its dispatch that "shootouts take place every day. Villages, farms, highways and motor vehicles are attacked". There are casualties among the Azerbaijani and Armenian population.

PRAVDA says in its commentary that "only one step separates Azerbaijan and Armenia from an inter-republican war". The newspaper refuted rumours that "interior troops are allegedly participating in punitive operations against the civil population".

In real fact, troops are implementing "the decree by the president on banning armed units unauthorised by Soviet legislation and the withdrawal of weapons if they are kept illegally". Over 100 firearms, 7,000 rounds of ammunition and about 500 kilograms of explosives have been seized in the region since April 15.

Russian Communist Party leader Ivan Polozkov believes that "the eruption of a veritable war between Armenia and Azerbaijan" was caused by "extremist and nationalist circles, which exploit the present situation when law and order as well as respect for laws are slack".

In an interview with the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper, he denounced "vicious attacks on communists advocating traditional friendship and cooperation between the two sisterly peoples".

The press writes about the situation in Georgia's areas stricken by a strong earthquake last week. The RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper reports that as a result of the earthquake, 114 people were killed, 70 are missing and about 1,000 were wounded.

A tremor registering 8 at the epicenter destroyed 82 villages in the Sachkhere, Oni and Ambrolauri districts alone, leaving 70,000 people homeless. The republican economy suffereed the damage of at least two billion roubles. Aid is pouring in from all parts of the Soviet Union to the quake-stricken areas.

Newspapers report another tragedy, which happened in Uzbekistan. A mammoth landslide plunged upon the small village of Dzhigiristan, Tashkent region, engulfing eight houses and 56 people.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA printed an article about an emergency situation with food in the Chita region.

TRUD writes about food shortages in Dnepropetrovsk, Ukraine. The newspaper sees the main reason for such a situation in the fact that "the government, giving no freedom to collective farms nor a free play to prices", is frightening the population with super-inflation and social explosions.

The newspaper writes that the government "is trying to replace the sound economy with distribution and competition with state monopoly".

The same newspaper features an interview with first deputy chairman of the executive committee of the Lvov Regional Council Stepan Davymuk, a representative of the Democratic bloc, who notes that the recent price hike in the country has increased opposition to the centre from republican parliaments.

He stresses that "the creation of sovereign republics is the only rescue for the present multinational state".

Central Committee Secretary of the Russian Communist Party Vladimir Kashin admits in an article published by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA that the production of livestock goods "dropped to a disastrous level" and that the country is "on the threshold of hunger".

He expresses an opinion that "the present agrarian policy should focus on the revival and development of public forms of production".

In an interview with the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper, American economist Igor Birman expresses an opposite opinion, stressing that Soviet businessmen "should be given a free hand".

He believes that "the disintegration of the Soviet economy has gained a tremendous speed, and only shock therapy can arrest this process".

The same newspaper features "the law on general principles of state youth policy in the USSR".

In a large interview with PRAVDA, Professor Nikolay Ternyuk, member of the all-union parliament, says that "if we make factors of renovation work, we shall be able to march ahead, without turning to the difficult road of capitalism".

The press carries a report about a meeting by the secretariat of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, where speakers expressed concern over the outflow from the party. The following data were cited: 1.8 million people left the party in 1990 and 587,000 in the first quarter of this year.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA informs its readers that the Soviet Union will soon be visited by Paul Weirich, who heads the American Free Congress Fund.

The newspaper stresses that "this visit is evidence of the persisting high interest of right-wing forces in the United States and other western countries in social, political and economic aspects of perestroika in our society and in the establishment of close contacts with radical groups in the USSR".

Ivashko Chairs CPSU Central Committee Meeting

LD0505223491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1750 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 May (TASS)—Speaking at the Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee, Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has called for a profound analysis of trends in the life of the party that emerged at the recent plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the CPSU. The press center of the CPSU Central Committee reported on progress at the Secretariat session today.

Those taking part in the Secretariat session took particular interest in the initiative of the CPSU Central Committee commission for renewing the activity of primary party organizations which has prepared recommendations for strengthening CPSU ranks. Talking of the work done by the commission, Yuriy Ryzhov, first deputy head of the Organizational Department of the CPSU Central Committee, noted that the commission has not been dramatizing the situation within the party but neither has it been shutting its eyes to crisis phenomena. He cited the following figures: in 1990 1.8 million people left the party the figure for the first quarter of this year was 587,000. At the same time there has been an increase in the number of people joining the CPSU: Throughout the whole of last year 108,000 joined, in the first quarter of this year alone 46,000 people joined the CPSU.

The CPSU Central Committee commission for renewing the activity of primary party organizations sees the main danger in growing pressure aimed at squeezing party organizations out of enterprises. Under these conditions, stresses the commission, the mass of communists is increasingly decided on cohesion and consolidation of party ranks.

In view of proposals made during the discussion it was decided to send the commission's recommendations to local party committees.

The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat discussed and approved the plan for ties between the CPSU and foreign parties.

Participant Praises Usefulness of CPSU Plenum

LD0305130191 Moscow TASS in English 1208 GMT 3 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow May 3 TASS—A plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee—which was held at the end of April and at which an attempt by conservative forces to remove Mikhail Gorbachev from the post of the general secretary of the CPSU CC failed—was useful for the party, Gennadiy Zyuganov, participant in the plenum and member of the Politburo of the Russian Communist Party (RCP), believes.

Many analysts reckon the leadership of the RCP, set up in summer last year, and first of all RCP leader Ivan Poloskov, among the most conservative wing within the CPSU.

"I agree that it was necessary to remove the resignation question from the agenda. But it is perfectly clear that the general secretary should pay closer attention to party affairs at this difficult time, and not confront party masses with a whole number of unpopular measures," Zyuganov told TASS.

On the whole, the plenum whetted the party's awareness of the crisis situation that has taken shape in the country, Zyuganov believes. "Our state 'reactor' has become heated up to such a temperature that a chain reaction of the disintegration of economic, national and state foundations is under way. This is extremely dangerous in the country which abounds in all systems of weapons and sophisticated production facilities," Zyuganov said.

His opinion is that the first priority is to stop the disintegration process. The joint statement signed by the president of the USSR and the leaders of nine Union republics recently may become a basis for stopping the disintegration and restoring manageability in the country, he said.

Touching upon the forthcoming Russian presidential elections on June 12, Zyuganov said that the RCP leadership asked the opinion of party organisations and work collectives as to whom they would like to see at this post.

The forthcoming plenary meeting of the RCP Central Committee in mid-May is to decide on who will be its candidate. Zyuganov's opinion is that the question of the powers of a future president of Russia is a major one. Russian presidential powers should be sealed in the republic's constitution, he believes.

"If a Russian president is granted the same powers as the president of the USSR within the framework of a single state, that would result in continuous confrontation even if those will be people very close in spirit," Zyuganov said.

According to him, the RCP is the target of acute attacks from various sides because it is "the most durable segment of the CPSU."

He spoke out against the emergence of any new parties or organisations on the basis of the CPSU. Such trends already manifest themselves. "The break-up of society's stabilising structures is misfortune, not a boon, at crucial moments of history," Zyuganov said.

Only 'United, Organized' CPSU Can Be Strong

PM0205192191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 May 91 Second Edition p2

[Article by K. Iskakov, director of the "Kaztekhenergo" Enterprise and member of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee: "Let Us Join Hands, Friends..."]

[Text] Alma-Ata—The complex, contradictory nature of the present situation in the country lies in the fact that, against the background of collapsing economic ties between republics, there is growing ideological pressure from so-called radicals. Profiting from our difficulties, they blame the Communist Party for everything; however, these smooth-tongued, emotional demagogues have not lifted a finger to extricate our society from its crisis and have nothing constructive to offer.

We must look the truth in the face: Forces have appeared in the political arena that have set themselves the aim of removing supporters of the socialist choice from power. Latter-day "democrats" have openly adopted a course aimed at the elimination of the CPSU and the disintegration of the USSR—exploiting pluralism and glasnost to this end—and taken up an anti-Communist, anti-Soviet stand. Essentially, they are already waging a cold civil war.

I am bewildered by the wait-and-see attitude taken by most party committees. The recent joint plenum of the Central Committee and CPSU Central Control Committee said that we must abandon our all-out defense and go onto the offensive. I would like to add that there is no longer any possibility of retreat; it is high time we rebuffed the demagogues and loudmouths pursuing narrow personal and group objectives. Otherwise the party will lose the political initiative completely.

I often ask myself why a party with a vast army of Communists in its ranks is inconsistent in carrying through its political line and lagging behind events? Why are Communists so passive? Why, when destructive forces take every opportunity to "call the shots" and make frenzied appeals all over the place? This is obviously inertia inherited from the stagnation era, when rank-and-file party members in primary organizations were assigned the role of merely implementing decisions and instructions handed out by their "leaders." Times have changed. Primary organizations have been given rights. Only they must act. We must feel we are active champions of perestroyka with the right to a deciding vote rather than just "little cogs in a big wheel." After all, the CPSU is not an abstract concept but a real force capable of extricating the country from crisis.

Our own primary party organization has not overcome the habit of awaiting instructions "from above" incidentally. Some interpret its new-found independence as an opportunity not to hold meetings—or, if needs must, then as few as possible. Meanwhile, at all kinds of production conferences, Communists are raising questions that the party organization simply must get involved in resolving. Questions such as social problems and cadre selection, for example. What does this show? It shows poor discipline among party members, reluctance on the part of some to burden themselves with additional responsibilities, and a parasitical attitude.

In my view, the activity of all kinds of "movements" and trends within the CPSU does nothing to strengthen the party's ideological unity. Disputes and discussions between them undermine the party, weaken its primary links, and play into the hands of anti-Communists. There was plenty of time for discussion before and during the 28th CPSU Congress. It seems to me that now, when the congress has approved the party's strategic line and statutes, all Communists must rigorously stick to them. Otherwise we will find ourselves facing anarchy and the total collapse of the CPSU. Our party will be strong if it is united and organized.

Shevardnadze Warns About Dictatorship

AU0605100791 Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG in German 5 May 91 pp 4-5

[Interview with former USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Michael H. Spreng and Friedemann Weckbach-Mara in his Moscow office; date not given: "Why I Fear for Gorbachev's Life"]

[Text] [BILD AM SONNTAG] When you resigned in December, you warned about dictatorship in the Soviet Union. Is that danger over now?

[Shevardnadze] No, the danger still exists. The social tensions are immense, and the people are disappointed. Reactionaries who want to have the old system back are organizing themselves. The calls for Gorbachev's resignation and for a state of emergency have shown the new dangers that we are facing throughout the country.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] Do you fear for Gorbachev's life?

[Shevardnadze] Those who, like me, assume that there is the real danger of dictatorship are bound to fear for him because we all are threatened by it: Gorbachev, Shevardnadze, and Yeltsin.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] Do the supporters of dictatorship already have a leader?

[Shevardnadze] We do not know at this point who he is. But who knew Hitler in Germany before he was carried up by the wave of popular dissatisfaction? Such a Hitler could also rise here. An unknown person could suddenly appear on the political stage with a program for order.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] Is there a danger of armed conflict?

[Shevardnadze] That is possible.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] Even civil war?

[Shevardnadze] Everything depends on whether we succeed in stabilizing the situation.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] How much time does Gorbachev still have?

[Shevardnadze] Only three to four months. I told the president and the government recently that the democrats must organize themselves quickly in order to be capable of action and salvage democracy; otherwise, reactionary forces, based on the old apparatus, will seize their opportunity. Then even the people will possibly advocate a new dictatorship.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] Could Gorbachev and his opposite number Boris Yeltsin jointly prevent that?

[Shevardnadze] That would be the only possible way. Therefore, I called upon both to cooperate. The entire democratic movement must demonstrate unity now.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] What should be the specific results?

[Shevardnadze] They must quickly implement the transition to the market economy. The people want to see results, in other words, they want to see food on the shelves; otherwise, they would ask why the market economy should be introduced if there is nothing to buy. The president knows that too.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] You are obviously still in contact with the president. Is Gorbachev still your friend?

[Shevardnadze] Our relationship is less intensive than it was in the past. We met recently, however, for a very positive talk. He has my full backing for his recent progressive statements and decisions. However, I have the right to criticize what is unacceptable.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] Your resignation caused a worldwide sensation. Had you considered such a step before?

[Shevardnadze] Yes, I had considered it repeatedly. When the time came for me to make a decision, I did not do so lightly. It was a matter of ethics, or else I would have had to back decisions for which I cannot assume any responsibility.

If there is a danger of dictatorship, if you are vilified and denounced for acting correctly, and if you feel that the most terrible things can happen tomorrow, without the people protesting, then a politician must be true to himself and go.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] What role did the reunification of Germany play in this context?

[Shevardnadze] I consider Germany's unity played a very decisive role. People who are not familiar with the elementary principles of big politics blamed me severely for having permitted Germany's unity. The only alternative to unity, however, was military force. That would have led to a third world war. My resignation was intended to signal peaceful change.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] Did your resignation give Gorbachev the time required to correct his course?

[Shevardnadze] Yes, it gave him time for a last chance. In this dramatic situation, my resignation gave the democratic movement an impulse for unity.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] Will you take over a government office once again?

[Shevardnadze] I don't think so.

[BILD AM SONNTAG] How about an international office? In New York you have been mentioned as the next possible UN secretary general....

[Shevardnadze] I am now working within the scope of my foreign policy society. I suggested creating an international ecological foundation allowing us to act quickly and successfully in the case of environmental disasters. As for the United Nations Organization, I have a very high opinion of Secretary General Perez de Cuellar. In my view, he should continue in office. Should he resign, however, and I am proposed, I would look into it.

Shevardnadze on Environmental Imperatives

PM0205193591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 91 p1

[Interview with E. Shevardnadze, president of the Foreign Policy Association, by Vitaliy Chelyshev, USSR people's deputy and editor of the all-Union environmental newspaper SPASENIYE, Salvation, on the eve of the former's visit to the United States; place and date not given: "Political Ecology"]

[Text] [Chelyshev] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, in your time as a politician—particularly in the international arena—you have won the sympathies of millions of people all over the world. Incidentally, your uncommon approach was a subject of conversation while you were still in Georgia, long before perestroyka: when the question of the republic's state language was being decided, for example.

Your sudden resignation was also untraditional for our power, to put it mildly. But even less traditional is the fact that your resignation has not left you a retiree in obscurity but has signaled the start of a new round of active political work, which appears to have given popular diplomacy the official status of an influential international force. As far as I understand the situation, in this work you give international environmental policy a very special role, and the term you proposed in 1989—political ecology—is being given completely new substance.

[Shevardnadze] The security of civilization begins with the security of the individual born into our complex age. As ecology embraces all the problems of private and global security, it will play a significant role in the near future in determining states' domestic and foreign policy.

Nuclear and conventional weapons, which are supposed to protect people against outside aggression, have long posed a very serious danger not so much for potential enemies as for their own peoples. Nuclear power plants, intended to provide cheap, virtually unlimited energy (plus plutonium for nuclear warheads—a fact which people try to avoid mentioning)—these "good," "peaceful," "clean" power plants have led to the horror of Chernobyl and Three Mile Island. The metallurgical and chemical giants, with which entire generations have linked their dreams of a happy, comfortable life, have begun to destroy their creators—and rivers, lakes, and forests at the same time.

For all this, two completely opposite processes are at work. On the one hand, there is a search for ways leading to mutual understanding and consensus decisions that will be equally useful for all peoples (that is what is meant by the term "new thinking"). On the other hand, there is an increase in mutual irritation and mistrust, attempts to resolve problems by force, and an incomprehensible confidence that one can protect one's own interests independently of one's neighbors' interests.

Naturally, the new thinking has impeded and will continue to impede this aggressive, selfish process. Against the background of political ambition, it could suddenly seem that the destruction of our home—the planet earth—is a secondary matter. People think: First we will establish who is on top, and we will worry about clearing up later. But you cannot resolve one problem without the other.

[Chelyshev] I know about your plans to set up an international (or world) environment fund that will bring together the material and intellectual efforts of various peoples to resolve global and local environmental problems—connected with disarmament, in particular.

[Shevardnadze] This is perhaps one of the most important ideas on which our association is founded. We cannot tackle it alone. In the course of its realization we are counting on support from our country's leadership and from the USSR president personally, who I know is concerned by these problems. We are also hoping for favorable support from the UN Security Council and from its secretary general personally; the interested attention of prominent politicians, with whom we intend to cooperate very closely; and the rallying of influential business circles and nongovernment foundations around this humanitarian idea.

The essence of the idea is to achieve the maximum concentration of resources and intellect to resolve specific, immediate tasks: Not simply to help regions suffering now, but also to prevent long-term negative consequences of environmental disasters, which, unfortunately, are very persistent. I see the future fund's tasks as being to extricate regions from environmental collapse, for example, and, at the same time, to draw up unified programs for regions which could repeat the same disastrous scenario, make people all over the world environmentally aware, and promote the application of the most outstanding environmental protection discoveries and inventions.

However, there are a number of questions I want to discuss with like-minded people in the Soviet Union and abroad before proclaiming them to the whole world. You must understand, the important thing is not so much to "crow cock-a-doodle-doo" as to hasten the dawn. But as far as support is concerned, I am asking for it now. Today.

[Chelyshev] On 22 April, Earth Day, the newspaper SPASENIYE proposed that the "Brazil-92" agenda be amended. Our "minimum program" proposes the following: the signing of an agreement in Rio de Janeiro on the complete, unconditional termination of all nuclear tests; the confirmation of accords on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; and the creation of a verification mechanism within the UN framework (in principle, it is a resurrection of the Baruch plan for new conditions). The "zero program" is an accord to concentrate expenditure on the joint elimination of nuclear arsenals and joint conversion programs.

[Shevardnadze] I agree with these proposals in principle, although it will be extremely difficult to implement them in the world as it is today. All nuclear powers will have to want this. We need a new climate, so that a state's authority does not depend on how many weapons it has.

[Chelyshev] Your articles on environmental subjects contain a great many theoretical propositions on the legal, organizational, economic, and financial problems of political ecology. The world is changing. Are your views changing too?

[Shevardnadze] The world is changing but experience of joint international efforts to find political solutions in the ecology-resource sphere remains the same—not very great. Not very great, but not so insignificant that we do not know what to take as a basis. The first serious generalizations have been made by Washington's World Resource Institute, which has given a general assessment of national and global economic loss resulting from the inadequate efficiency of environmental cooperation.

The specific measures proposed by the center for the promotion of international talks on the environment (Salzburg, Austria) are interesting. The basis of its proposals is to set up consulting centers and study courses to overcome shortcomings in the development of the international legal contract system. That is the proper thing to do. It is no longer enough to simply define the range of program issues requiring joint decisions. When embarking on action, we must be able to avoid stumbling over the traditional pitfalls in world relations.

Three such pitfalls which appeared during the cold period in international relations are obvious.

First, the possibilities for reaching a consensus are limited, because the "agendas" for talks usually do not consider the interests of all the countries concerned.

Second, when selecting new eco-political objectives, countries traditionally try to preserve the old ones, which are largely outmoded and consequently even hamper the task of reaching agreement.

Third, many countries exaggerate their environmental requirements in order to attain strategic advantages.

Too many "pitfalls" have accumulated throughout the world: documents, laws, sovereign interests. Meanwhile, our sovereign planet is gradually losing the potential that allows it to be called a living planet.

[Chelyshev] I thought you were an optimist.

[Shevardnadze] I am an optimist. After all, a true optimist is someone who is aware of all the pitfalls but manages to keep going anyway, even smiling in the process. He smiles because he hopes—because he knows—that he will get there in the end.

Former Leaders' Diplomatic Postings Listed

PM0105114191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 May 91 p 1

[A. Vasilyev report: "Ordered To Go West..."]

[Text] We have learned from well-informed sources that Vsevolod Murakhovskiy, former chairman of the USSR State Agroindustrial Committee, is transferring to diplomatic work. He is preparing to take up the post of agricultural counselor at the USSR Embassy in Canada.

This posting is another illustration that our country affords well-proven cadres zealous treatment, flinging them from one difficult front to another. Last year alone:

Suren Arutyunyan, former first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, was appointed consul general in Casablanca (Morocco);

Semen Grossu, former first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, was appointed agro-industrial complex attache at the USSR Embassy in Mexico;

Georgiy Razumovskiy, former secretary of the CPSU Central Committee secretary and candidate member of the Politburo member, was appointed consul general in Shanghai (PRC);

Vasilyev Zakharov, former deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, was appointed economic minister-counselor at the USSR Embassy in Yugoslavia.

Pension Fund Reported in 'Catastrophic' State

PM0305150991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 May 91 Moscow Evening Edition p 3

[T. Khudyakova report: "Pension Fund 'On the Rocks'"]

[Text] The situation regarding the USSR Pension Fund's revenues can be described as catastrophic. According to data, as of today only about 30 percent of expected payments have been received.

It is well known that this fund came into being in extremely complex financial circumstances. Circumstances, moreover, so complex that it was obliged to apply to the government for credit in order to guarantee essential payments. I will recall the fact that the Pension Fund's resources go toward the payment of pensions and benefits for children, in other words, the most socially unprotected groups of the population.

It was assumed that the credit would suffice for the first months of operation, and the anticipated revenues would be enough to make payments and repay debts. However, the situation has been aggravated by the fact that the price reform has required colossal additional expenditure.

Crudely speaking, the Pension Fund finds itself "on the rocks." Since part of the credit has been spent on these purposes, the government is promising to make up this shortfall either from the public purse or from other sources. But this is not the point.

But what is to happen with the retirees? It is all the same to them from what "source" the money comes—provided that on the set day the "man with the big bag on a strap" comes along and brings the set amount of rubles.

Yes, many enterprises find themselves in a difficult financial situation; many kolkhozes and sovkhozes are loss-making; cooperatives have thrown all their efforts into their own survival; but this is truly still no reason for not honoring their obligations to the old and the very young. Finally, there is a law obliging at least the nine republics which joined the Pension Fund on a voluntary basis to make insurance contributions.

The USSR Pension Fund reports that some enterprises and cooperatives have become keen on employing contract workers. At the same time, contract work is not counted on labor service records. And an enterprise is not obliged to make insurance contributions for contract workers.

The result of this not particularly honorable game is apparent: The lives of old men and children are in jeopardy. This is why the USSR Pension Fund is making a tearful request to debtors: Pay your debts.

Afghan Veterans Union Officially Registered

PM0105114991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, POSTFAKUM, and REUTER roundup: "Union of Veterans of Afghanistan Acquires Legal Status"]

[Text] After long agonizing the USSR Ministry of Justice has registered the Union of Veterans of Afghanistan, our correspondent N. Burbyga reports.

"Our union has been in existence for two years," Aleksandr Kotenev, chairman of the Union of Afghan Veterans, said. "But it has not been registered all this time. What does the union gain from registration? With the acquisition of legal status we received strictly recorded rights and duties. That is, we will now be able to operate in the civilian world on our own behalf and take responsibility for our commitments. For instance, in order to implement one of our most important tasks—the medical rehabilitation of Afghan soldiers—the union had to pay foreign clinic bills in hard currency. Since we did not receive regular aid from sponsors, we were forced to replenish our hard-currency resources via our own activity. Our status as a corporate entity allows us to obtain licenses."

Murmansk Officer Falsified Union Poll Results

PM0205134291 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 14, 7-14 Apr 91 p2

[Unattributed report: "Murmansk: He Held A Referendum by Himself"]

[Text] The Murmansk garrison procurator's office has brought an action against Captain Yu. Stasenko, from one of the military building units. Being an ardent supporter of preserving the Union, he was dissatisfied with the referendum results in his unit, where Stasenko's view was shared only by 43 percent of voters—55.5 percent against.

The captain decided to amend the situation and...burned all the completed ballot-papers. After that he drew up a decisive report altering the voting ratio. In Stasenko's opinion the number of those in favour of preserving the Union in his unit should not be less than 92.5 percent. The tally of opponents dropped to 3.5 percent.

Kalugin Hit for Claims on Markov Murder

91UF0682A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Apr 91 First Edition p 4

[Article by G. Razumov: "Can We Get at the Pope, Too?"]

[Text] As you know, the Bulgarian dissident and political emigre Georgiy Markov died in London in 1978, under unclear circumstances. That event served then as the script for still another anti-Soviet campaign which was meant to discredit both the Bulgarian special services and the KGB. The British did not do anything at all to find out the real cause of Markov's death.

The "Passion according to Markov," however, subsided over time, in spite of all the effort applied by the English special services. Some additional means were needed to resurrect the public interest. As one such means they used O. Gordiyevskiy, a double agent who had been illegally transported by the English from Moscow. The traitor was transformed into a "coauthor" of the script without delay. However, the English special services were not able to add another twist to the subject of KGB participation in the "Markov affair." Then they decided to reproduce the story in thousands of copies by publishing the book "KGB—The View from Within" (1990) by K. Andrew. To ensure publicity, O. Gordiyevskiy was added in partnership with the author. Again there was no effect.

It seemed that nobody and nothing else could revitalize the canard of disinformation that was expiring in full view of everybody. But all of a sudden such an attempt was made by no other...than former KGB official O. Kalugin.

O. Kalugin explained the sensational details of the "Markov affair" to the unbelieving public, but he concealed having borrowed them from the book "KGB—The View from Within." Reading his "revelations," one recalls the lines of a popular song: "Something has happened to my memory, I remember everything that I was not part of." But O. Kalugin could tell some facts he really knows. He could talk about the mysterious death of Soviet citizen Panchenko in Switzerland, or about the well-known case of CIA agent Ogorodnik, in which the American agent M. Peterson was caught with material evidence during a rendezvous with him. The former general should know of many such cases. But he is not concerned with the truth.

I wonder, what else will O. Kalugin invent after the "Markov affair" story dies down? Will he declare himself an "expert" on the assassination attempt on the Pope? He truly has a vivid imagination.

Economic

11 Kuzbass Mines Resume Operations

LD0505223791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2056 GMT 5 May 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Another 11 mining collectives in the Kuzbass started work today. Meetings of labor collectives are being held at 26 mines that are idle, where the miners will decide what to do next. At a number of enterprises they have decided not to go back to work until the center agrees to the transfer of the coal field's mines to Russian jurisdiction.

Ukraine Miners Back at Work

PM0505155291 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[Roundup of reports from IZVESTIYA correspondents N. Lisovenko in the Ukraine and V. Kostyukovskiy in Kemerovo, and TASS correspondent V. Makarov in Vorkuta: "Is the Strike Ending?"]

[Excerpts] This year will undoubtedly go down in the history of our mines. Such a long and stubborn miners' confrontation is without precedent. Recent days have brought reassuring news from Kemerovo and Donetsk. But the northern miners have yet to find a "peaceful" solution to the crisis. Here are some brief on-the-spot reports.

The Ukraine: Miners Go Back to Work

By N. Lisovenko

[passage omitted] For the first shift, miners showed up for work at all but two of the Ukraine's coal enterprises. Workers at the "Oktyabrskaya" and "Yuzhnodonbasskaya No. 3" are still clarifying the position.

Thus in the Ukraine today 248 out of 250 mines and mining administrations are at work.

Kemerovo: The Strike Goes On

By V. Kostyukovskiy

More than 60 enterprises in the Kuzbass, including 51 mines, are continuing the political strike.

It is well known that B. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, signed an order in Novokuznetsk on 1 May on transferring coal and other enterprises in the basic sectors of industry to the jurisdiction of RSFSR state administration organs. In the opinion of M. Kislyuk, deputy chairman of Kemerovo Oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee], this document differs from a great many issued earlier in that it creates a legal, normative basis for the formation of market relations in industry and the switch from the administrative management system to the economic system. Basically the content of the order will make it possible fully to meet the economic demands of the July 1989 strike.

But what about the political demands? The council of strike committees has taken note of the Russian Federation leadership's efforts to meet these demands, and apparently is no longer making the ending of the strike directly dependent on their immediate fulfillment. But another condition has come to the fore: a joint USSR Cabinet of Ministers and RSFSR Council of Ministers resolution on the transfer of Union property on the territory of the Russian republic to the jurisdiction of RSFSR organs. According to some information, such a document could be signed in the next few days, and only then will the council of strike committees return to considering the question of continuing or halting the strike. [passage omitted]

Coal Strike Resumes in Vorkuta

LD0405225691 Moscow TASS in English 2156 GMT 4 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Makarov]

[Text] Vorkuta May 5 TASS—The already tense situation in the city of Vorkuta, in the extreme north, has further aggravated. Most of its 13 mines resumed work late in April, after agreement had been reached between the federal and Russian governments on the transfer of enterprises of the Vorkutaugol amalgamation to the jurisdiction of Russia. Now the strike flared up again. The Severnaya and Oktyabrskaya mines were at a standstill on Saturday. Part of the sections are functioning at three mines. Some of them are working on the permission of the strike committees in order to keep mines in working order and supply their boiler rooms with fuel. Another three mines are producing coal only for the city and miners' townships nearby.

The situation worsened after the Vorkuta strike committee issued an appeal to Vorkuta miners late in April. It said that, in the opinion of the strike committee, the strike ended too early, because no concrete results have been achieved." Taking into account the pledge to the Russian Government to deliver 20,000 tonnes of coal a day to the Cherepovets metallurgical complex, the city strike committee finds its necessary to continue the delivery of coal by some mines. If need be, several sections of the mines will resume work, because coal reserves at coal yards are being depleted.

Alexandr Cherkasov, member of the Vorkuta Strike Committee, told TASS that the strike would end after the economic and political demands of the miners were met, or when all the necessary documents for the transition of Vorkutaugol enterprises to the jurisdiction of Russia were signed "on the terms acceptable for their labour collectives."

Meanwhile, the damage inflicted by the strike continues to grow. Coal production at Vorkuta mines fell short of planned targets by one 1,100,000 tonnes in March and April. The figure for the past 24 hours was 23,000 tonnes.

Cabinet Orders Study of Price Rise Compensation

PM0605112391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent: "At the USSR Cabinet of Ministers"]

[Text] This TASS correspondent was informed by the USSR prime minister's press service that the Union Government, as a control measure, had examined the progress in fulfilling its resolution of 6 April this year "On Additional Measures To Provide Social Protection for the Population in Connection With the Retail Price Reform." This was prompted by the fact that, judging by letters from citizens, press reports, and other indications, in a number of regions republic and local administrative organs, and management at enterprises, organizations, and educational establishments have still not embarked on implementing the compensation envisaged by the resolution for the increased cost of public catering at people's places of work and study. The delays in implementing measures designed to alleviate the difficulties of switching to market relations are making people justifiably unhappy and are adversely affecting public sentiment.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has instructed the USSR Ministry of Finance, the USSR Ministry of Trade, and the USSR State Committee on Prices to make local visits within 10 days to analyze the prevailing situation and to report on the results at an enlarged Cabinet session with the participation of the leaders of republic governments and local organs of power, and representatives of a number of labor collectives.

Consumers Reportedly Wary of Compensation

914D0184A Moscow TRUD in Russian 24 Apr 91 p 1

[Letter to the editor and two articles by TRUD correspondents: "Ate Little for Three Weeks..."]

[Text] **Three weeks have passed since the price increase. The government's promises of compensating for the losses remained promises. The worst victims of the new prices are the less protected parts of our population—retirees, families with many children, etc. Well-qualified workers have "got theirs" also. This is seen from the information sent by our local correspondents and from the letters of our readers.**

Blacksmith Mishutkin: "Running Away"

Several times I watched the work of Anatoliy Mishutkin, team leader at the Ryazan automotive units plant: fast and undetectable movements, precise timing, and a smile on his handsome, tanned face. But the familiar smile disappeared after 2 April. Mishutkin and I are shopping and looking at the prices of what is still left on the store shelves in Ryazan stores, even if it is goods sold for the miserly coupons. The manufactured goods store, next door to Mishutkin's house, has whole sections standing empty. Hangers from suits that disappeared some time ago are lying in heaps, as if offered for sale. An abundance of bedding seems to be a compensation for the lack of suits. The prices are "suitable," too. A blanket is R43, a sheet, R42, an ordinary pillow slip is selling for R8.

But then, the special store Poultry at the outskirts of the workers subdivision has an abundance of chickens. If you can sometimes find chickens in ordinary stores at R5 a kilo for coupons, here the "special" chickens sell at R7 a kilo and no coupons. Broiler chickens that used to cost R4.50 now sell for as much as R9.

"There you are," said Mishutkin sounding somewhat guilty. "As you see, even with my salary of R500 a month and my wife's of about R200, we have to spend all our money on food solely to provide meals for us and our two sons. No one is hiring vegetarians to man the smith's hammer as yet. Nothing remains for clothes. I simply cannot afford to pay R500 for a suit, but then there aren't any suits, anyway..."

The sky-high jump in prices has dealt a painful blow to all the workers of the plant, which is a major branch of the Moscow ZIL. "Not one of our smiths goes anywhere for lunch any more—we cannot afford it. We bring things from home," says Anatoliy Semenovich. The best metalworkers, grinders, and metal turners have left the plant to seek better pay. They found jobs in cooperatives where the wages are incomparably higher. That compensates for the everyday expenses that increased multifold. Even the plant manager left...

[Signed] V. Gorodetskiy, TRUD correspondent, Ryazan

Head of a Family With Many Children: "Boycotting the Stores"

I am the head of a big family—me, my wife, and five children. Our eldest daughter is a first-year college student. My salary is R300, my wife gets R150, we also have a pension and a stipend. On average we have R92 per person per month. How we can manage to live on that kind of money, I cannot imagine.

What are our expenses? A school uniform now costs R60 instead of R12 as before. Boots for girls cost just as much. So we decided to "boycott" the manufactured goods stores. In grocery stores we are buying the cheapest things for coupons. If we go to a market it is like going on an excursion. We do buy apples for the kids sometimes however, they cost "only" R7 a kilo.

I started making my own furniture and other things for the house. My neighbor taught me how; he is just as poor as I am. My wife is a good dressmaker. So she is using her skills to alter the dresses of our older girls for the younger ones. Recently she made jackets for the girls out of a relative's light coat; they turned out wonderfully. We have a lot of free time now after work, so we stay at home making all kinds of things. We cannot go anywhere on vacation. We wanted to buy bicycles for the whole family to go out of town, but now they sell for close to R300. We cannot even dream about a car. All our thoughts now are on one subject—the feed, if you excuse me. We decided to lease a plot of land but the one we were offered is 40 kilometers away from the city. It costs R15 just to get there. So, we are trying to decide whether the game is worth the candle.

Our local church helped us a lot—they sent us 35 kilos of a variety of groceries. People at work are also helping us as they can. The only people who do not provide any help are the ones whose duty it is—the rayon soviet executive committee, the social security department, etc...

My advice to those who want to have children is to learn sewing, to master some other skills and then to try to figure out what you are going to feed the kids and whether your relations can help you. Don't count on the government. A family with many children must be a burden for it. Only, who is going to drive a combine or operate a loom in future?

[Signed] V. Anisimov, department head of the Verkhnevolzhgidromet administration, Nizhniy Novgorod

The Novikovs, retirees: "Stopped Drinking Milk..."

I used to see the retirees Novikovs every morning standing in line for milk. Suddenly I noticed that they had stopped coming there.

"Could my old people have gotten ill?" I thought, and one evening I rang their door bell. The husband opened the door. He only smiled bitterly to my question: "What milk are you talking about now? Now bread, salt, and water are all our food..."

With the husband's permission I turned on the tape recorder.

"Let us start with our income. Until quite recently my pension was rather big—R124, add to this the R108 of my woman's pension and the two April compensations of R65 each. All in all that makes more than three hundred—normal, it would seem. But it isn't. The trick is that all our expenses have grown so that I feel we might switch to planting turnips."

Here Yegor Semenovich started counting on his fingers: "Rent, radio, electricity, television fee—all that put us out of three tens, at least. After 2 April, food costs over R70. Are you with me? We have already counted a hundred plus. Last Sunday I went to the market since my old lady was sick; it seems I did not buy anything much—some sour cream and cottage cheese, half a chicken for soup, a kilo of potatoes, one lemon, and two apples. I left R65 there. And there is bread, salt, matches, tea... At current prices the two of us spend not less than R25 a month on bread alone.

"We have not been able to do the laundry ourselves for a long time now, so this past week I took some laundry to the laudromat; I should have stayed home. The streetcar fare was three kopeks, now it is 10. A glass of soda water from a vending machine is five times more expensive now.

"What else can I say? Me and my lady held on so tight to our April pension, but it is close to zero already. And the end of the month is not even close. A day or two later we will have to dig into our "emergency funds"—the funeral money. When that money is gone I do not know what we are going to do. Collect empty bottles? But all the profitable locations for that were divided among other, poorer people a long time ago. You are asking me why we stopped going for milk. We cannot afford it any more..."

The next day I received the following information in the oblast social security department: In March, just before the April retail price reform, 153,000 people were paid a pension of R100 or less. Now they also have R65 from compensation. Nevertheless, if you compare the life of those 153,000 people with that of the Novikovs, they have it even harder and are hungrier.

[Signed] P. Varfolomeyev, TRUD correspondent, Voronezh

FROM THE EDITOR. **It is obvious that after 2 April the deprivation and suffering of our people have worsened. But we did not witness the promised sharp increase in labor productivity. On the contrary, skilled workers started leaving government enterprises for various cooperatives, exchanging their machines for costume jewelry production. Teachers are leaving schools, lecturers are leaving colleges...**

What is going to happen next? Will past mistakes be taken into account as the anticrisis program gets implemented? There are some encouraging signs: The government seems to have heeded the voice of trade unions and it is going to propose in May a draft law on indexation of people's incomes. It is also going to propose a number of anti-inflationary measures. However, there are some reasons for concern also. The same government is trying to take the wind out of trade union sails with its attempts to ban strikes and to gain the right to fire employees without informing the trade unions. The last plenum of the General Confederation of USSR Trade Unions decisively repulsed this proposal. It is hard to tell how things are going to develop in the future. But the question remains: Till when are our talented, hardworking people going to lead a beggarly existence, tied hand and foot by what is in essence antimarket relations?

Economic Aspects of Union Treaty Spotlighted

PM0205132991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 May 91 Union Edition p 2

["Viewpoint" article by Yu. Sharipov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Commission for the Economic Relations of Republics and Autonomous Entities, and Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Sadikov: "The Anticrisis Program: The Union and the Republics"]

[Text] The joint statement by the USSR president and the leders of nine republics of 23 April confirmed the commitments of the Union organs and the republics enshrined in the economic agreement for 1991 and the need to carry them out without fail. There are other documents regulating economic relations between the republics and the Union which have not had due significance attached to them so far.

After all, the creation of the legal basis for the new economic relations among the components of the federation actually began exactly one year ago. The USSR Law "On the Bases of Economic Relations Between the USSR and Union and Autonomous Republics" was adopted in April 1990. The law is not perfect, but it does provide something to lean on, as it were.

Article 8 of the law is specially devoted to the responsibility of the USSR and the republics for the nonfulfilment of commitments in the economic sphere established by agreements. It talks about compensation for losses on the part of both the Union and the republics. But it is not enough just to make a declaration, you need to create an implementation mechanism, but so far the legal norm has been a dead letter. Indeed there is no norm, given that it is not applied.

The legal bases created must be developed and given specific shape and all the basic spheres of economic management must be switched to a union-republic footing. From this perspective much time has been lost, although there are positive examples too.

The practice of the first months of implementing the economic agreement between the USSR and the republics for 1991 and interrepublic agreements has revealed substantial shortcomings in this process. Therefore the inclusion of agreements between the USSR and republics and of multilateral and bilateral treaties and agreements among republics within the legislation applied in resolving economic disputes deserves support. It would be advisable to examine the question of vesting the USSR Supreme Court of Arbitration with the power to resolve disputes arising out of agreements and treaties between the USSR and the republics.

The Union treaty should play a crucial role here. However, in the economic section of the draft Treaty on the Union of Sovereign Republics the demarcation between the competence of the Union and the components of the federation is inadequate, in our view, and the relevant implementation mechanisms have simply not been envisaged. It may be objected that the Union treaty is too important for this document. But we do not think that is the whole problem.

We cite the following for the purpose of comparison. The law on the bases of economic relations between the USSR and union and autonomous republics contains nine articles and the draft Union treaty only five devoted to economic relations. At the same time the Treaty of Rome establishing the EEC, which was concluded in 1957, contained around 200 articles and, most importantly, it has operated from the moment of its signing to the present day inclusive. The effectiveness of the law is backed up by a well-oiled mechanism for its implementation.

The last comma in the anticrisis program has not yet been written. On the contrary, the Cabinet of Ministers has been instructed to carry out necessary refinement by 20 May. We offer a few considerations.

It is possible to start the implemention of the program only by coordinated steps with the republics. This requires that the actions of the Union cabinet and the actions of republic governments, supreme soviets, organs of the banking system, and so forth be delimited.

It is also necessary to determine the priority of individual measures. Based on the results of the meeting between the USSR president and the leaders of the republics, it is paramount that a special work regime be introduced in the base sectors of industry, at enterprises producing consumer goods, and on railroad transport. The adoption of decisions on indexing incomes, providing the population with foodstuffs, and maintaining a good balance in relations between agriculture and other sectors come into the same category.

Dangerous trends undermining the country's unified banking system and breaching the USSR Laws "On the USSR State Bank" and "On Banks and Banking" have taken shape. Given the prevailing conditions, the introduction of a unified monetary and credit policy is clearly possible now only on the basis of introducing an emergency regime in the sphere of banks and finances.

It would be advisable to remove in the draft Union treaty questions concerning the implementation of a unified credit and monetary policy from the joint competence of the USSR and Union republics and vest the appropriate powers in the USSR. In the version of the draft agreed as of now (Article 10) any republic can object to the implementation of USSR laws in a given sphere, as it relates to the joint powers of the USSR and the republics. The operation of USSR law will thus be blocked.

The program should contain clear-cut guidelines which are capable of being understood and approved by the population. In that case its publication in reworked and abridged form will help stabilize the sociopolitical situation. We are above all talking about actions connected with the population's survival. This section must guarantee the population a certain standard of living for which the government assumes rseponsibility and to achieve which it proposes a series of tough, unpopular measures.

This is in point of fact a survival program and consequently its priority over all else must be clear to everyone. Only immediate and resolute measures linked in this way will be supported by the bulk of the population.

Inadequate attention is paid in the program to the fact that the process of expanding and developing the "market zone" has to go through certain stages.

From the standpoint of determining the sequence of actions the sections [of the program] on measures to speed up the development of enterprise and denationalize and demonopolize the economy, on priorities in structural perestroyka and in scientific and techniocal progress, and on stepping up foreign economic activity could be refined, in our view.

On the whole, the program is obliged to ensure that it is in the republics' interest to strengthen the Union via the economic advantages which it offers. Negative consequences should ensue for those who violate the Union-republic accords which have been reached and refuse to observe the rules of the single economic space or transfer resources to the Union budget and other funds. That is a basic truth. We think that it is necessary to back the government's intentions as reflected in the program. To be precise, by a prescribed date republics which have taken particular positions shall be given an opportunity to state their attitude toward observing the rules existing in the Union. Those who still refuse to heed economic realities will be excluded from the system of centralized material and technical supply and transferred to payments at world prices using the commercial rate of the ruble.

It would be expedient to examine the question ensuring that the treaty between republics not belonging to the Union and the USSR contain clearing-type agreements which reflect the import-export balance in world prices.

The reality in this sphere today is such that the total share accounted for by the Baltic republics, Armenia, Georgia, and Moldova in interrepublic deliveries expressed in world prices is as follows:

—for output dispatched from those republics—7.7 percent,
—for output brought into those republics—12.5 percent.

In other words, a negative balance.

The total share accounted for by the same republics' (measured in world prices) is:

—in the Union's exports—2.3 percent,
—in the Union's imports—5.4 percent.

In other words, a negative balance again and one which considerably exceeds the export figure itself.

The use of world prices would make it possible to really achieve equivalent exchange and remove the republics' just and unjust claims and distrust regarding one another and the Union as a whole. If individual republics among those which have refused to sign the new Union Treaty agree to use national currencies in their turnover, clearing agreements must provide the conversion of the balance of payments into freely convertible currency.

Of course, this is an extreme case we are talking about. The experience of the USSR's foreign economic ties with the East European countries in the new conditions (from the beginning of this year) showed how critical such approaches are to both sides. Furthermore, our partners endured trials a hundred times more difficult than the Soviet Union's. All this has to be paid for, however. Thus, the longer the unity of the economic space throughout USSR territory is preserved, the smaller everyone's losses will be. We must work toward this using all the legal means at the disposal of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and Supreme Soviet.

Scientific

Japanese Partner's Bankruptcy Strains Energiya

LD0505195791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0918 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Tokyo, 5 May (TASS)—It appears likely that the Soviet launch vehicle "Soyuz", launched last August, will remain the only "space vehicle" boasting the logo of the Japanese "Pax Corporation Limited" [as received] on its board. As the MAINICHI newspaper reports today, an unexpected bankruptcy of the well-known Tokyo- based corporation leaves no hope that a contract it earlier signed with the "Energiya" scientific-production association, specializing in the design and production of space transportation crafts, will be ever fulfilled.

According to the document, "Energiya" pledged, among other things, to place advertisements on their spacecrafts' frames and to launch the company's satellite into orbit, as well as retransmit Japanese television programs via Soviet satellites. Fulfilling the contract with "Pax Corporation Limited" promised, for "Energiya", considerable financial gains which would by no means be superfluous for the scientific-production association which, like many enterprises in the USSR has entered a complex stage of conversion. However, instead of receiving hard currency, Soviet spacecraft- builders are faced with the need to count their losses. The Japanese corporation's bankruptcy left "Energiya" among its 200 creditors currently awaiting debt compensation from their former partner in business. The Japanese failed to pay their bills for over $4.5 million of work already completed by "Energiya". This is the first time, MAINICHI writes, that the Soviet side has suffered a considerable loss from cooperation with Japanese companies.

Mir Cosmonauts Preparing To Undock Vehicle

LD0505131991 Moscow TASS in English 1304 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—TASS correspondent reports from the Flight Control Centre:

Viktor Afanasyev and Musa Manarov are beginning their sixth month on the "Mir" scientific research space complex.

The cosmonauts have spent the past two days on final jobs with the automatic "Progress M-7" vehicle. The equipment it delivered to them had to be installed in the station and its modules. The ballistic capsule, included in the cargo vehicle, had to be prepared for return to the earth. The "Progress M-7 is expected to leave the orbital complex on May 6.

The crew has also carried out several experiments with the use of "Buket", "Sprut-5" and "Lyulin" instruments in order to measure cosmic radiation and check the radiation situation in the near-earth space.

Afanasyev and Manarov feel well.

Crews Accomplishments Reviewed

LD0405213391 Moscow TASS in English 1941 GMT 4 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—Cosmonauts Viktor Afanasyev and Musa Manarov have been working at the Mir orbital complex for five months. They arrived at the orbital complex on December 4, last year, together with Japanese TV journalist Toehiro Akiyama.

The crew of the 8th main expedition fulfilled an extensive programme of physical, astrophysical, technological, medical, biological and other experiments for various branches of the national economy.

There emerged some difficulties in their work. The unmanned cargo spacecraft progress M-7 brought a lot of trouble to the cosmonauts. They managed to dock it only after the third attempt on March 28.

The latest, fourth spacewalk on April 26, could hardly be described as a success. The examination of the aerial of the Quant module showed that the cosmonauts could not repair it themselves during the spacewalk.

The cosmonauts are now getting prepared to welcome the Soviet-British crew. The start of the Soviet-British space mission is scheduled for May 18.

Soviet-British Crews Leave for Launch Site

LD0405114691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1050 GMT 4 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow, 4 May (TASS)—The two Soviet-British Crews, the main one and the back-up, left today for the Baykonur launch site for prelaunch preparations for the joint space flight, TASS was told at the cosmonauts' training center.

The first crew comprises Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarksiy and Sergey Krikalev and the Englishwoman, Helen Sharman; the second crew comprises Soviet cosmonauts Aleksandr Volkov and Aleksandr Kaleriy and Timothy Mace, who is British. The state commission will decide on the eve of the launch, which is scheduled for 18 May, who will fly into space. To date, however, Helen Sharman has the greater chance, since she is in the main crew.

Sergey Krikalev and Aleksandr Volkov are experienced cosmonauts. The former spent 153 days in space during his flight, and the latter has already worked in space twice. Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Aleksandr Kaleriy are new recruits to space.

The two crews are equally well prepared for work in the Mir orbital complex, stated Aleksey Leonov, deputy chief of the cosmonauts' training center, in a conversation with TASS. Working there now are the crew of the eighth main expedition, Viktor Afanasyev and Musa Manarov, who went up on 2 December last year with Japanese journalist Toyohiro Akiyama. Now they are due to receive the international crew. Then they will return to earth with the British research cosmonaut. The international flight will last eight days.

Military

Army Paper Defends Baltic Servicemen's Union

PM2904135991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[Colonel M. Ziyeminsh report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Why Spread Rumors of a Coup?"]

[Text] Riga—When the new "Union of Baltic Servicemen" sociopolitical group was set up last year the local media took practically no notice. Now, however, there has been a sharp turnabout.

The fact is that a number of republic newspapers, including the district newspaper ZA RODINU, published draft documents of the Servicemen's Union—the rules and regulations of the Union itself and also an address from the coordinated center to USSR servicemen. Let me just say one thing: This organization like others encounters costs and difficulties linked with the formation period. Personally, I thought the period for elaborating the guiding documents extremely protracted and, in my opinion, not always worded in the most elegant manner.

But in my opinion there is nothing wrong with the actual idea of such a union. It has set as its aim the defense of the USSR's integrity, unswerving observance of the Union Constitution, and the defense of the legal interests, rights, and freedoms of servicemen from the Armed Forces, the KGB, and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and members of their families. All the more so as it is well known that in the Baltic republics these rights are often violated by local organs of power.

So why has this unexpected reaction to the new organization's activities suddenly emerged now?

I think that this is all connected with the talks which are beginning between delegates from the USSR and the Latvian Republic. And above all in order to "reinforce" the army theme during the talks.

Officials Comment on Soviet Military Spending

LD0505141491 Moscow World Service in English 0000 GMT 5 May 91

[Kucherenko, Ochirov recordings in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] Looking for ways out of the financial blind alley in which the Soviet Union has found itself in, taxpayers are focusing increasing attention on the big defense budget. Many people find it exaggerated. This year the Defense Ministry got 20 billion rubles more than last year. However, the military says that the actual spending on Army needs is shrinking.

The head of the parliamentary Budget Committee, Viktor Kucherenko, accounts the paradox to the recent price reform:

[Begin recording] [Kucherenko] At the beginning of the year we introduced new wholesale and purchasing prices. This increased by 60 percent the spending of the companies and organizations supplying military equipment and Army goods, and that's why though the actual sum earmarked for military spending increased, its real level decreased, and this tendency might continue. [end recording]

[Announcer] Nevertheless, the military will be forced to tighten their belts. The national parliament is discussing the austerity budget for the second half of the year. Prime Minister Pavlov does not conceal the fact that military spending will be reduced. The money should support the Army we have today, not the one that the public thinks (?of) reduced to the level of sufficient defense.

According to Viktor Kucherenko, the Committee has nothing against the way the Defense Ministry tends to dispose of its budget. Spending on the purchases of arms has been cut down by almost 36 percent, while spending on social needs of servicemen has been sharply increased. The Defense Ministry has a realistic idea of its financial future. It has given up several programs of developing new weapons. It feels that a further reduction of spending on this purpose might undermine the technical potential and defense capability of the armed forces and these programs still arouse criticism. Deputy Chairman of the Parliamentary Defense Committee Valeriy Ochirov considers this criticism unfair:

[Begin Recording] [Ochirov] We criticize the Defence Ministry too much. The criticism is sometimes groundless. The Ministry is doing everything it can for the social security of servicemen. A great share of responsibility lies on the government. In one of the countries from which our troops are withdrawn, fuel and overcoats were sold for $8-10 million. As soon as the Soviet Bank for Foreign Economic Relations received the money, the government snatched it—the Defense Ministry did not get a penny. You must understand that the Defense Ministry is not omnipotent. [end recording]

[Announcer] Valeriy Ochirov, who is not just a member of parliament but an army officer, notes this from his own experience:

[Begin recording] [Ochirov] I have [word indistinct] children and the family income is 257 rubles per person a month. I figure it out that I will find it hard to make ends meet. That is more or less enough to feed the family, but then I also have to pay the rent, the phone bills, and buy clothes. If the public and members of parliament do not realize the gravity of these problems, do not take the right steps on time, the country's defense might be greatly damaged. [end recording]

Baltic Republics

European Parliament Delegation Visits Estonia

LD0105140691 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] The press service of the chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet reports, via ETA, that a delegation of the European Parliament's liberal democarat and reformist [words indistinct] was received today by Supreme Soviet Chairman Arnold Ruutel. The delegation arrived in Tallinn today and met with Estonian Government leader Savisaar, Deputy Foreign Minister Liimets, leaders of the Liberal Democratic Party and the Estonian committee, and [word indistinct] specialists. The Supreme Soviet Foreign Affairs Commisison organized a dinner in honor of the guests. Various aspects of the political and economic situation in Estonia were discussed during the conversations. The European legislators were interested in human rights issues in particular. They declared their readiness to support the Baltic states' initiative to organize a conference on Baltic issue.

Tomorrow they will go on to Riga.

Latvia Celebrates Independence Anniversary

Gorbunovs Delivers Speech

LD0405140791 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0808 GMT 4 May 91

[Speech by Anatolijs Valeryanovich Gorbunovs, chairman of the Presidium of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, at the plenary session of the Latvian Supreme Council in Riga on 4 May—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed deputies of the Supreme Council, government, and esteemed guests: The best indicator of the processes that have occurred in society is time. Even though a year in history is too short a moment in time, today, in turning our thoughts back to the road we chose, we can say that the step we took in adopting the declaration of independence was a correct one, because time itself has demonstrated that we had no other alternative. The past year has been extremely eventful. We have experienced so much and survived. We have been both supported and rejected. There were mighty and impressive meetings organized by the People's Front of Latvia to support the Supreme Council and government of the republic. Our joy in the rebirth of the nation overrides everything. Regarding the role of the People's Front, we can say briefly: The People's Front was our strong voice. Now it has become a constructive opposition as well, because life has shown ruthlessly and harshly that ease and euphoria cannot last long. Inevitably they are followed by a wave of depression, as well as a critical attitude. A moment arrives when one must get on with heavy, grey, and tiring work. One must assert oneself not just in words but in deeds. The old truth becomes new. In times of change, the one who is able to live is the one who relies on himself and his own work. There have been, and still are, denials of the 4 May declaration. On 15 May, representatives of the Soviet Army, using force, tried to influence the Supreme Council to act as if defending socialism, a unified and indivisible Soviet Union. There was also the attempted overthrow of the state in January, and the crude and tragic events on 20 January. Even though the barricades built by the people were not of a military nature, they showed everyone that one cannot reckon without the unity and courage of the people. The results of the all-Latvian people's poll on 3 March were a convincing reflection of the relation of forces in the republic, and again testified that the path we have chosen is correct. The Communist Party of Latvia still favors the introduction of administration by the USSR president to preserve the achievements of socialism and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the dismissal of councils at all levels and the restoration of its own power. [passage omitted]

The legal status of the independence of the state has not changed. We are still where we were on the eve of 4 May 1990. The only difference is that there are no (?heroes) and no special [word indistinct], but the year has given us very much in the practical sense of working at legislation. The time has come when we can summarize the legal practice of this year. Our fundamental law has already been worked out. Of course, discussion has arisen as to the content of this basic law and its nomenclature. [passage omitted]

There are also contradictions between the will of the legislature and the actions of the government. These contradictions have been quite sharp and unpleasant, especially in recent times. [passage omitted]

In my opinion, a paradoxical situation has come about: Those who favor socialism are the first to change to using the market economy and becoming private owners. It would be logical if they were to be the first to favor the rights of former private owners. [passage omitted]

One of the main arguments of the opponents of the sovereign independence of Latvia (?to conclude their numerous threatening statements) is to present the fact that Latvia has no crude oil or gas (?to market). [Word indistinct] the Latvian economy is an integral part of the USSR economy. Thereby, economic life would stop and unemployment would start. I think it is clear to everyone here that the economic integration is to be preserved, but it will be between states on quite different principles than those supporting it at the moment. It will be based on mutual profitability, because even Russia, in the circumstances of its national economy, is basing itself on economic profitability and not on abstract communist goals. The Russian Supreme Soviet has adopted an unmistakable stance and will not let the center divide, redistribute, and then take possession any more, but will act for itself, which it has done in taking over the management of coal mining.

Latvia has its own road, which the Supreme Council and the government too, more or less, are taking—that is the road of state independence and economic self-reliance. We can (?buy) those raw materials to the extent that we have earned them by production. That is the simple but major principle of independence that we have observed in our activity. In fact, for half a year, the Supreme Council and government have worked out an independent tax law and an independent budget and begun price reforms. The results are not altogether satisfactory. We do have an independent budget, and we are not asking the center for money, but we are haggling as to how much of this money we will give the center. [passage omitted]

Esteemed deputies: The fate of Latvia in January was determined to a great extent by the people at the barricades in Riga. This same technique, these same people, this year determined Latvia's economic fate working in the potato furrows, fields, and on the farms. These rural people with their calm and their resolution filled us all with faith. Now this faith is (?mixed) through our rural people, because they are pressed not just by difficulties but by uncertainty—uncertainty as to whether they can cope with the new farms—because everything necessary is lacking, being put into the large farms. The Supreme Council and government are struggling to do everything to supply agricultural production. As is known, in this critical situation it is necessary to supply more than 400 million rubles for agricultural needs from the budget. This year the Land Commission, in accordance with the law on land reform, must perform very responsible work. [passage omitted]

Esteemed participants in this plenary session: The Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia has been recognized as the sole democratically elected institution by many legislatures. We have established stable contacts with the legislatures of all European states, the United States, and Canada. The road we have chosen is not easy. [passage omitted]

Western leaders are hurrying at every step to remind both Baltic politicians and those in Moscow that the West is prompting the Baltics to push for a clarification of relations with the Kremlin—just to clarify them, not to blur them or entangle them. Will we in turn come forward with proposals for Moscow? Are we convinced that all the democratic forces of Russia are in favor of the state independence of the Baltic republics? Often even the very progressively inclined anti-imperialist militant Russian democrats are at best silent when there is talk of the Baltic issue. The term separatism, which has appeared in the official lexicon, is confusing not just reactionaries there. We do not have sufficient propaganda for the concept of independence east of Zilupe [on the Latvian-Russian border]. Evidently our legislature and government have to make their political strategy and tactics known not only to the president of the USSR, but also to the whole world, whose representatives, like it or not, perceive the Baltic problem, which we are striving to make an international problem, in the context of the USSR. If the economic border of the USSR and Latvia is closed, our people and residents of all nationalities face a catastrophe. One must acknowledge with satisfaction the fact that in the talks with the official delegation of the USSR Government, agreement was reached that in talks between the Republic of Latvia and the Soviet Union that there cannot be priority and secondary questions; that at the same high level both the sovereign status of Latvia and economic and financial questions are to be discussed. [passage omitted]

In the Baltic Council, at the moment we are not only coordinating our political activity, but we have also begun the first consultations for creating the structure of a pattern for Baltic states. We will do everything not to repeat those sad experiences of cooperation by the Baltic states before the war. [passage omitted]

In our eastern policy, evidently our legislature and government must more clearly express their negative attitude toward anti-Latvian, anti-Russian, anti-Semitic recidivist inclinations. [passage omitted]

Esteemed audience: Only by actively cooperating with the whole of society and observing its current needs and interests is it possible to create a system of legislation that supports and corresponds to civic harmony and exists on principles that observe each person and his honor. I wish to call on deputies to always remember that an ethical result in politics cannot be achieved through unethical means. Strive to shape yourselves and cultivate in yourselves those qualitities that will make the words politicians and intelligentsia synonymous; that would be an achievement for us all. To restore the Latvian state does not mean only judicial procedure. To restore the state means to restore its spirit, environment, and society, of course, on a modern level. Even the most ideal legislature could not restore the physical and spiritual existence of a state. That can only be done by the whole Latvian nation.

Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Godmanis Gives Speech

LD0405205291 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0838 GMT 4 May 91

[Speech by Ivars Godmanis, chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers, at the plenary session of the Latvian Supreme Council in Riga on 4 May—live]

[Excerpts] Respected chairman, respected deputies, guests, ladies and gentlemen:

Today I would like to present a brief survey of the government's activity in implementing the Restoration of Independence Declaration of the Republic of Latvia.

Proceeding along this road, we tried to gradually get rid of the USSR political and economic supreme leadership, to form structures of an independent state, and to create preconditions for a democratic, civic society that would be based upon free market economy and private property.

Such a sharp simultaneous replacement of state and economic structures is unavoidably connected with serious shocks in the society, which essentially affect the standard of living. What was and is at the basis of the government's activity, therefore, is to guide the process of political and economic changes, to ensure its irreversibility, a stable tempo, and not to allow chaos.

In starting the extensive program of economic reform, we advanced at the center of our activity everything that is connected directly with the protection, in the course of the rapid changes, of the less well-provided strata of the society. On the other hand, we are trying to release to a maximum the economic enterprise of the society's active part.

These complicated tasks had to be tackled in quite a tense internal and external political situation, while the the border of Latvia with the USSR is still open, but our contacts with the external world are under the control of the USSR. The classic models of the changes in Eastern Europe cannot be applied directly in Latvia.

Under these conditions the government of the Republic of Latvia has generally succeeded in ensuring the control of the situation; however, various bodies of power of the USSR or their branches still continue to function on our territory. These include the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] State Security Committee, the Latvian SSR procuracy, the USSR customs bodies, and the banks.

The larger all-Union enterprises, harbors, and other properties have not been taken under the republic's jurisdiction. In many instances this manifests itself in a certain ambiguity of power both in the economic and the political sphere.

A majority of the mentioned state services, at least externally, behave neutrally toward the independence endeavors of the Republic of Latvia and are not resisting them; however, some are openly boycotting us. This has to be said especially about the institutions directly subordinated to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Operations on a vast scale against the independence of the Republic of Latvia are being led politically by the Latvian branch of the CPSU. Precisely its leaders were the members of the All-Latvia Salvation Committee who publicly announced the takeover attempt on state power in January of this year. Precisely the events of January led to provocations, resulting in human victims and considerable public and political tension.

At the moment, the communist party has not abandoned its plans to overthrow the Supreme Council and government of the Republic of Latvia. Toward this end, demagogical slanders and calls for political strikes are disseminated. At the same time, various extremist military and public formations are being created.

This active internal counteraction to the independence road of the Republic of Latvia is inseparably connected with the dual policy of the USSR leadership regarding Latvia. While saying it recognizes republics' sovereignty and the rights to self-determination of peoples, it in fact continues the old, imperial policy of unitarism and by all means strives not to allow the restoration of the Republic of Latvia as an independent state.

The failure of the planned coups d'etat in the Baltic republics and the reaction of the entire world's international opinion, evidently influenced the USSR president to start talks with the Republic of Latvia on regulating the contentious political and economic questions.

Although these talks might initially be meant as a diplomatic maneuver by the center, it is our task to change them into an effective mechanism to prepare the next talks between the Republic of Latvia and the USSR at the highest level, which would lead to the USSR recognizing the Republic of Latvia as an independent state.

The activity of the Government of the Republic of Latvia is being exceedingly negatively influenced by the increase of political and economic instability in the USSR. Latvia is not able to isolate itself from the economic collapse that is rapidly developing in the Union. [passage omitted]

When adopting the restoration of independence declaration, great hopes were placed upon the support of the Western countries, the Western countries of the world, and upon the public opinion; however, this was less than expected. Whereas we received unfeigned support from the small countries, especially from the northern countries of Europe, the (?position) of the great powers is considerably more restrained. This can be explained partially by the striving of the leaders of those countries to avoid a destabilization of the situation in the USSR, and the interest to receive the support of the USSR in the solution of their problems.

Therefore, the task of the Latvian Government in foreign policy, in the direction of the West, is to make the internationalization of the Baltic states' independence a priority, to strive to achieve influential international commissions and also the convening of a special international conference on this question, and to include our independence question in regular international conferences, in the Helsinki process, and elsewhere. At the same time, the government must do everything to involve Western capital investments in the national economy of Latvia, which must become a significant component in the development of future economy of Latvia.

It must be noted that during the previous period, the Western countries were not ready for a recognition of the Government of Latvia, neither de jure nor de facto.

This demonstrates that our achievements in foreign policy in the West will depend to a great extent on how successful we are in settling our relations with the USSR.

No less important will be in how civilized a manner we know how to settle our internal problems. I would like to stress: in a civilized manner, precisely in the Western understanding of democracy, so we do not get into contradictions in our nations of social and national justice, of human rights.

This approximately is the political background upon which the republic's government has to begin an extensive economic reform which foresees free activity of enterpreneurs and market economy. [passage omitted] The budget deficit threatens to approach 1 billion rubles [R], up from the current R500 million. This cannot be tolerated in any way when developing an independent economy. [passage omitted]

The principal task of the government during the current period is to find those mechanisms of economic stimulation that would activate production by fully giving up the old means of affect of the administrative economy. In the situation when the ministries fulfill the state's functions, and when there are, basically, only taxes and prices at the government's disposal, the presence of such a mechanism of activation is compulsory. [passage omitted]

In the sphere of state administration a number of adminstrative-juridical questions are being solved with difficulty.

One of the most complicated questions is, and remains, the question on the status of the USSR Armed Forces in the Republic of Latvia. It must, however, be noted that from mutual conflicts we have reached, on the whole, neutral positions that allow preparations for serious talks with both the leadership of the USSR Army and also the Baltic Military District.

A government commission for such talks has been created. For the time being the work proceeds in four main directions: first, the numerical strength and status of the USSR Armed Forces stationed on the territory of Latvia; second, alternative labor service; third, the stock-taking of the land areas allocated to the USSR Armed Forces and the ecological situation in them; and fourth, the supplies, housing, and social questions.

Unfortunately, to any extent, constructive talks for the time being are taking place only in the last working group—that is, on the everyday social-life questions. The others, in their essence much more complicated questions, are still not moving forward.

The spring call-up into the Army is approaching, but there are many unclear matters concerning alternative service. Most important, the adoption of the relevant law at the Supreme Council is delayed.

What is clear, alternative service cannot remain, according to its contents, such as it was. It must be that the young men called up into it—and there are more than 11,000 of them—would realistically fulfill their obligations.

During the current political and economic destabilization period the government strives to strengthen the protection of citizens' rights. We see that the criminal world is becoming more active. Violence against persons and also large-scale machinations and crimes of an economic nature are especially increasing.

To strengthen the efficiency of the activity of the administrative bodies, we have strived to create the necessary initial foundation for the Procuracy of the Republic of Latvia, the reform of the militia has been resumed, and salaries have been increased for its workers. During the recent days the newly created militia patrol service battalion was sworn in. For the time being, approximately 200 men comprise this unit. Most of them have been physically trained and have acquired combat methods. We hope that this will be a realistic force for an efficient fight against organized crime and banditry.

As a result of the reform of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the bureaucratic apparatus has been reduced and at the same time the number of rank-and-file militiamen and district inspectors have been increased.

There are difficulties at the moment with technical provision, modernization of armaments, and also with the composition of cadres. I would especially like encourage Latvian boys to join the militia. For the time being, the nationality composition of the militia still does not correspond to the nationality compositon of the inhabitants of Latvia.

Being guided by the interests of protecting citizens' rights, the republican government is also actively working in the sphere of legislation and in the consolidation of juridical services.

Apart from legislative and executive power, a strong power of courts has to be created in the republic. [passage omitted]

The government considers that today the court of the republic is no longer a loyal servant of either the Communist Party or of any other party and structure of power, but stands firmly in the position of adherence to and execution of the new laws. [passage omitted]

In conclusion, I want to say what is most important.

The government has a concrete plan of actions, in each of the component parts of forming an independent economy; as in taxes, so in the budget, prices, finances, and in privatization. Furthermore, the government is ready to consistently implement this plan, at the same time tackling difficult political and economic questions with the USSR Government, and also with the Western countries on the de facto restoration of the Republic of Latvia.

We, however, the members of Latvian society, must understand that only when we personally advance for ourselves and concrtely fulfill our program, in which by our work and our political stand we will be united on the road to the restoration of independence of the State of Latvia, only then the entire people and the government serving it will be capable of realizing the fundamental goal of all of us: a politically independent and economically free, strong State of Latvia.

Thank you for attention. [applause]

Gorbunovs, Godmanis, Dinevics Hold Briefing

LD0405172891 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0959 GMT 4 May 91

[News conference by Anatolijis Valeryanovich Gorbunovs, chairman of the Presidium of the Latvian Supreme Soviet; Ivars Godmanis, chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers; and Janis Dinevics, Latvian People's Front leader, moderated by correspondent Anta Busa on the first anniversary of the declaration of independence of Latvia in Riga on 4 May—live]

[Excerpts] [Udris] Janis Udris, APN correspondent in Latvia and editor of the newspaper (?ABELE). I have a question for Mr. Gorbunovs. Tell me, Mr. President, what is your opinion of the unity of the three Baltic states in collaborating on the road to independence? Do you regard this collaboration as optimistically as Mr. Ruutel did in his speech? Is there, after all still a lot of unexploited activity, especially external? You work together, and the world mainly talks about the Baltics together—about the Baltic states together—not separately about Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Thank you for an answer.

[Gorbunovs] The world, especially the West, wants to see the Baltics as a united factor, both in politics and in economics, as well, perhaps, as in forming a bridge or a link between northern Europe, Europe and the East. We, too, are very conscious that such small states and such small nations have difficulty in taking steps separately, however significant, in forming separate policies, and also in the context of world politics today; furthermore, such separate steps are unproductive too. Therefore, perhaps in this formation of joint steps, joint policies, and a joint union, our thought has not at all been that it has to be that way. In practice the steps we have taken are, unfortunately, not altogether, you could say, broad, because here, at the moment, there could be a tense situation in relations with the USSR; furthermore, in these relations each of the Baltic states is seeking its own specific access, as it were. This situation is perhaps, to some extent, still disturbing at the moment; action taken jointly could be more productive now. As we said here today, however, we all are resolved that what we have done—that is, creating a joint secretariat that is already functioning—is to get this joint action to increase every day for us, not only in stated policies but also in concrete action. It must be said that irrespective of the Baltic Council, the government, ministers, several public organizations, and several economic institutions have already begun such cooperation, and they simply feel a need for such cooperation. I do not exclude the possibility that in the future we will be like the Nordic countries in having our own legislature, our legislature of Baltic states. In what form it will function, how consistent it will be, and everything else, is a question for the future, but it appears this road will go toward the creation of such a model for the Baltic states. I think that this road will determin (?Where we have to go).

[Matveyev] Georgiy Matvetev, NEVSKIY KURYER newspaper, Petersburg [as heard]. I have a question for Mr. Godmanis, if you please. You said that the road had become more (?realistic) over this past year. I remember the [word indistinct] conference before the opening of the last session on 3 May last year, and much was said then about the armed forces and this or that movement. How do you assess things now? When will the troops be withdrawn from the republic? I mean regarding the statement by the 10 as to what steps may be followed here.

[Godmanis] I still think that the statement by the 10 and the military question are not of the same order, although I undoubtedly think that the statement by the 10 is a substantial movement in relation to virtually a democratic choice as to whether to be a member of the new union or not. I think, however, that practical union structures not of the 10, but of the presently functioning ones are operating with great inertia, and I fear that they will simply transfer those principles to the structures of the Army, the KGB, internal troops, and so forth. So before talking about withdrawal of troops—this question is premature—I think that we must first define the status of the troops, and here there are very specific points. I mean the numbers of the troops, their movements and deployment, how the local authorities are informed about their conduct, and naturally their loyal attitude to republican laws and decisions, so to speak. This is a very difficult question, and although negotiations on it have started with General Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff, as well as with the minister, Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov and the Military District—even though the District does not decide much here, it all depends on central decisions—we must proceed from this to talk about such really quite farsighted plans. As to the withdrawal of the troops, the concept is being looked at, both in factions, as I am being told, and also in a commission; there are also negotiations at the governmental level. Of course, our aim is clear. It is to be a neutral state, and only time will tell whether there will be military bases in that state, with the corresponding number of servicemen and so forth. So the question is untimely, and I would not link it directly with the statement by the 10. [passage omitted]

[Rybina] Alia Rybina, Leningrad CHAS PIK newspaper. A question to Mr. Gorbunovs, if you please. In what aspects of relations with the West would you like to see more understanding? To put it another way, what attitudes of the West do not suit you currently?

[Gorbunovs] Over the past months, especially January, February, March, and now April, we have had very active contacts with the legislatures of the West. There is virtually no country in the West, especially northern Europe, America, and Canada, with whose legislatures we have not established links. Moreover, these links were established not simply as exchange visits. They were already established at the following level, at the level of committees and commissions, which is very important for us, because the democratic experience of the work of those legislatures is very important for us. The second thing that is very important for us, and I spoke of this in my speech, is that these legislatures recognize our legislature as the legally elected legislature that represents the will of the people of Latvia for the restoration of a democratic, independent state.

Now, regarding your question about what may not fully satisfy us. This is the main thing for you, of course, in your question. It seems to us that we are not entirely satisfied with the caution that is often displayed by the legislatures, especially those of big countries, inasmuch as we understand that first and foremost their political standpoints are very important for us. On the other hand, however, we understand that the big countries sometimes have to be more cautious in grand policy. It seemed to us that there are no obstacles, for example, preventing the Baltic question, or the question of the Baltic states, being examined at an international conference, since we consider that the Baltic question is a question not only of an internal affair of the Soviet Union—it arose as a question in the sense of international affairs in connection with the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact and so it also should be examined now in an international context. [passage omitted]

[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent] [name indistinct], SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, a question for all three participants in the news conference. What prospects for Latvia's obtaining de facto independence in your view are opened up by the statement by the 10; does Latvia intend to make use of these prospects, and in what way?

[Gorbunovs] Our prime minister, Ivars Godmanis, has already said that the prospect of democratic choice has opened up. Despite the fact that there are certain conditions at the end of the statement that could be assessed as political pressure, it is indeed the possibility of democratic choice that has appeared. So, as I see it, there is a—I would not use the word breakdown or any other such word; [I would use] a more convincing, but perhaps a more diplomatic word—transformation of the Soviet Union taking place, and we are also involved in that process. We cannot be outside that process. So some people are putting it like this: It is a breakdown, and it is better for us because it is a chance for us to carry out more radical actions and acquire independence. Perhaps that is so, but on the other hand it seems to me that if nine republics form a union on completely different conditions, first I feel, for example, it is a positive thing that now reproaches to us regarding the USSR Constitution having no meaning at all anymore, since after the statement of the nine, the USSR Constitution is, in effect, not in operation, because a completely different way has been chosen for forming the union. [sentence as heard] Personally, if these republics and legislatures choose this way of union, I would only wish that union success and would wish the Republic of Latvia and the legislature to have the very best economic and other relations with the new union. [passage omitted]

[Bombin] Bombin. I have a question for Mr. Gorbunovs. Anatolijs Valeryanovich, what are you expecting from the forthcoming visit by Ivars Godmanis to the United States? I already asked Mr. Prime Minister this question, so now I am interested in your view. Thank you.

[Gorbunovs] First, today we cannot discuss all the details of the visit, since they are still being worked out. I at least think, however, that the conference that Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis will take part in is very important from the point of view that many representatives of the business world will be taking part, for whom the Baltic question is very important. [passage omitted]

Of course there will be direct contacts with senators, congressmen, and specific business people of the U.S. Administration. They are expressing genuine interest in everything that is taking place here. I think these meetings will also be very useful for us all.

[Litvinova] Litvinova, IZVESTIYA newspaper. My question is for Mr. Dinevics, as leader of the People's Front faction. Yesterday it became known that the only opposition representative was excluded from the commission for negotiations with the USSR, as I understand it at the insistence of your faction. He is the leader of the Equal Rights [ravnopraviye] faction, Sergejs Dimanis. I do not see him, this colleague of yours, at this news conference today, either. Perhaps this is a chance combination of circumstances, but possibly it is the start of some new political stage in relations with the opposition. Can you please comment on these facts for me?

[Dinevics] Yes, well, I did not organize this news conference, and I cannot say why Sergejs Dimanis was or was not invited here. Concerning the composition of the delegation that is conducting consultations with the delegation that is headed by Mr. Velichko, however, our faction discussed this problem, and we could not find the answer to one question: If the delegation in Moscow holds consultations on the restoration of the independence of the Republic of Latvia, and if Mr. Dimanis denies the need for restoring the independence of the Republic of Latvia, should he be present in that delegation? Also taking into account the fact that on the eve there was a meeting in Riga of all three communist parties of the Baltic states—the communist parties on the platform of the CPSU—and there were fairly strong threats voiced at it addressed to the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia. Mr. Dimanis, being a representative of the Central Committee of that party, took a sufficiently active part in it, and the faction considered that it would be better if the Presidium of the Supreme Council were to exclude Mr. Dimanis from that delegation.

[Pukitis] Maris Pukitis, JURMALA. I have a question for Mr. Gorbunovs. The main purpose for which the struggle for Latvia's independence began was the survival of the Latvian nation; therefore, I would like to ask: How do you assess the prospects for the Latvian nation at the moment, and what must be done for the good of the cause?

[Gorbunovs] To answer very briefly, of course, is hard, but I will try, perhaps, to do it. First: an undeniable factor is that we must create an independent state, because the fate of all small nations, such as the northern nations, the fate of their survival, and their fates are determined by their statehood, their independent statehood. So we will pursue this road on which we are traveling and which we have declared consistently. Another parallel road is linked to our understanding of the internal life of peoples here in the Republic of Latvia, and in the understanding of several nationalities' life. On this road I again favor, in the interests of the survival of the Latvian nation, these attitudes of ours being not only correct but in both sides' interests, in the interests of both the survival of the Latvian nation and for the survival of other peoples' cultural autonomy and for the preservation of the identities of cultures and nations in Latvia.

[Busa] Thank you. Last question, go ahead, Mr. Rimsans.

[Rimsans] Janis Rimsans, Rigas Bals. As far as is known, the draft of the republic's new fundamental law is coming about at the moment. Does this mean that the Supreme Council is charting a course so the activity of the constituent assembly in Latvia will not be restored, that its legal successor will be ignored? I would also like Mr. Godmanis, to comment on the publication in ATMODA of his Soviet... of the joint cooperation projects with the USSR and Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic State Security Committees? Do you deny the existence of such a document, and will you demand a concrete explanation on this question from the newspaper? Thank you.

[Busa] First question. To whom was the first question, Mr. Rimsans?

[Rimsans] To Mr. Gorbunovs. Go ahead.

[Gorbunovs] The principle of the constituent assembly, we have declared, on its basis we have announced our declaration of independence. Furthermore, the principles, the main principles, of this constitution, are currently in our activity, and here it seems there is no difference of opinion or problem so one would want to refute it and create it somewhere else. It seems to me, when, in this period, in my speech I did not want to define these periods thus—and it is good that I did not do it either, because immediately there came those greetings that were clearly to be seen at the same periods; viewpoints are already created that I think are of a transitional period, at which one could smile if we start graduating them a great deal and variously constructing them. Undeniably it is this, that from one side we cannot create new laws in all spheres in a moment; in my view, the Latvian state, independent of the fact that these problems were the same, ought to use the old laws, and we did that too, in changing them, abolishing some clauses, as is happening with us at the moment. [passage omitted]

[Busa] Mr. Godmanis was asked about the publications in ATMODA.

[Godmanis] Yes. About the publications in ATMODA: first, in any case I doubt the competence of Mr. Mednis to judge these questions. [passage omitted]

[Busa] Thank you. Thanks to Anatolijs Gorbunovs, Ivars Godmanis, and Janis Dinevics for the news conference. Thanks to the journalists for taking part. [passage omitted]

Latvian Independence Jubilee Celebrations Viewed

PM0505133791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 91 Second Edition p 3

[O. Meshkov report: "No Lavish Celebrations"]

[Text] Riga—The streets of Latvian towns and villages were decked with national flags yesterday: The anniversary of the adoption of the declaration of independence was being celebrated. The day before, practically all the newspapers had carried interviews with prominent politicians and statesmen, who were asked to answer the question: Has Latvia moved closer to independence in the last year? The answers differed, of course, but one thought came clearly across: The economy is in a critical state, unfortunately, and, as is known, the economy determines at least a great deal, if not everything.

In an interview with the newspaper RIGAS BALSS Latvian Supreme Soviet Secretary I. Daudis stated: "...In terms of our status we are still in the same place we were on the evening of 4 May last year." He ranked the four hundred laws and decisions adopted by the republic legislature as positive developments. "The most important thing," the secretary continued, "is that morally, legally, and economically the Latvian people are gradually being rehabilitated—from restoring an individual's freedom to reintroducing the old street names."

In terms of freedom, it seems to me that very many peasants will disagree with this as they wait anxiously for the lands they have cultivated for decades to be returned to their former owners. The hired labor system that lies ahead and freedom are very different things, you will agree.

It was decided not to hold lavish anniversary celebrations in the republic. Furthermore, the newspaper UTRO YURMALY [Jurmala Morning], not without irony, draws readers' attention to the fact that in fact the jubilees of two documents are being marked this month—the Latvian Republic declaration of independence and the USSR president's decree, which declared that declaration invalid.

Yesterday was overshadowed by the following event: Special-Purpose Militia Detachment Commander Cheslav Mlynnik was shot and wounded on the landing outside his apartment. An investigation is being conducted.

Latvian Special Militia Chief Wounded in Shooting

LD0405180591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1721 GMT 4 May 91

[Text] Riga, 4 May (TASS)—An attempt was made today on the life of Cheslav Mlynnik, commander of the Riga detachment of the Special Purpose Militia. It happened as he opened the door of his apartment in a house in the center of Riga.

He was taken to the district military hospital, where there is a resuscitation unit. The surgeon on duty announced that a bullet had passed right through the right half of his chest, that the patient had been given the necessary aid, and his life was no longer in danger.

An investigation has been started by the Procuracy of the Latvian SSR. Andris Reyniyeks, deputy procurator of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], believes it to be a terrorist act with political aims. According to him, the procuracy has information about constant surveillance of the detachment commander.

Latvian Deputy Informs Danes of Baltic Situation

LD0305121591 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 2000 GMT 2 May 91

[Excerpts] To become familiar with the political situation in Latvia, a large group of Danish journalists—approximately 40 people—has arrived in Riga. They met deputies of the People's Front faction of the Latvian Supreme Council. At a news conference, representatives of various legislative commissions participated. For your information we present what deputy Janis Dinevics said about the political situation in Latvia and about the talks with Moscow.

[Begin Dinevics recording] At the present time it appears that after the January-February events, a certain kind of a period of calm has set in, but in my opinion it is not so.

As you know, recently all three Communist Parties of the Baltic states gathered in Riga, and on being interviewed Mr. Rubiks again expressed certain threats against those processes of democratization which at present are taking place in the Baltics. [passage omitted]

The second, let us say, component part of the faction's work plan is the political activity, which is basically directed toward the necessary internationalization of solving the Baltics' problem. Everything possible is being done to convene an international kind of a conference at which there would be talk about recovering the independence of the Baltic states, and not any longer at the level of professors, but at the level of statesmen.

It is with precisely such a request that we have applied to the Government of Denmark. It appears to me that we have been shown a great deal of understanding, and that Denmark is ready to help us a great deal in this matter.

Some kind of certain initial information is necessary to hold this international conference, and it would be very desirable if there were an international commission to study the Baltic problems here on the spot, one that was aware of their historical course and able to give its constructive recommendations to such a conference.

This internationalization of the Baltics problem is also the basis for achieving very serious talks with the Soviet Union, with the center and with Moscow.

The Union does not want serious talks with the Baltic states. What is taking place at the moment is a pretense to talks, which are more consultations and making the initial contact, because the delegation appointed by USSR President Gorbachev—according to its composition and the positions occupied—is not competent to sign any serious document that would tackle the problem of the Baltics. This delegation is competent to tackle some trivial agreements—let us say for 1991 on our economic relations. In the course of these consultations the next round is on 23 May. The Latvian side, undoubtedly, will demand that the opposite side accurately define the aims of the consultations, and will also request a reply regarding when the USSR side will be ready to move from these consultations to serious talks.

Also, the USSR embassies throughout the world have begun a sufficiently extensive campaign of disinformation about the Baltics. An attempt is being made to create a notion in the world that the Baltic states do not want talks. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Sajudis Seimas Council Holds 4 May Rally

More Than 100,000 Demonstrate

AU0405201091 Paris AFP in English 1904 GMT 4 May 91

[Text] Moscow, May 4 (AFP) — More than 100,000 people demonstrated Saturday in the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius to show support for the breakaway government of the Soviet Republic, local journalists said.

In a speech, Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis reaffirmed his government's desire for independence from the Soviet Union and declared that the republic "will never sign the new Union treaty."

Mr. Landsbergis is to meet next week in Washington with U.S. President George Bush.

The demonstration was called by Sajudis, the main nationalist movement.

Landsbergis Addresses Rally

LD0505104291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1439 GMT 4 May 91

[Speech by Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis at Sajudis rally in Vingis Park, Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] Hello, dear people, who have assembled here in such great numbers. I am glad—we all are glad—we are together, and I know this is only a small group of us, but the entire spirit of Lithuania is also together with us. [passage omitted]

We are together and will remain together—both those who are present here and those in their homes, who are watching and who will see and hear your accounts. Sajudis is alive, and while it continues to live, no one will push Lithuania away from its path. [shouts and applause] This is because Sajudis is not embodied in some membership lists, nor in membership cards kept in pockets, but can be found in people with hearts, who are alive and desire truth and freedom. [shouts and applause].

We are faced with many tasks and many labors. We have inherited all sorts of difficulties and troubles. You have seen for yourselves how one inherited structure has perished. [applause] [passage omitted] Between those dates, there were also bloody sacrifices, without which one can hardly expect freedom, when one has to confront such a merciless—I would say, for the time being—enemy. He, too, will have to change or to withdraw. He will have to share. He will have to withdraw from what has become outdated, what is inhumane. [applause] Moreover, we will arrive at an agreement with what is humane in Russia, in the Ukraine and elsewhere—with those forces who also seek and yearn for freedom, democracy and justice. [applause]

Unfortunately, this is far from simple, for the time being. I do not need to recall also the events that have continued even after 11 and 13 January. [passage omitted] The threats are very strange and the actions are very strange. They transcend not only into armed violence but also into robbery. We have an old and tried Lithuanian proverb that has probably been tested by long experience—one who is capable of lying is also capable of stealing. [applause]

We truly want a different life, a different state, a different order, that will not be as the other—the one that is still wavering, that is based on falsehood and where, as we know, nearly everything is being stolen.

From us, also, they steal some very strange things. Not only say, some truck or other, for which a different sort of agreement could have been reached, and was against agreed upon [as heard]. They steal rubber materials, hammers and nails, and a small paint barrel; however, they also steal the mind and they steal freedom. [passage omitted]

We have been promised various forms of attack. New financial tricks have been promised—perhaps some new half-currencies or seizures of our earned and real currency, or perhaps even of banks. We want to have our own currency and we will have it; however, who can say whether they will not arrive with their tanks to seize it, even in banks, just as Saddam Husayn arrived and first took Kuwait's gold. Moreover, what shall we use to defend ourselves? How are we going to defend ourselves? Whether it could be our little paint barrel, or the earned assets of Lithuania, or Lithuania's spirit and mind and independence, that are being stolen.

That is why we wish to discuss things. I wish to remind you of certain matters and tell you some things.

The threats that are being heard, more frequently at some times, less frequently at others, are also familiar from last year—from the nice country in the East, they are promising to withold from us the nice little sun of oil. They will demand some sort of sudden payments—perhaps some payment that they think we will be unable to meet. They threaten to tear away chunks from Lithuania. They even threaten—sometimes more loudly, other times quietly—whispering into our ears, that they will force us out of Vilnius, the sacred city of Lithuania. As if we would leave to the Burokevicius gang the Castle of Gediminas, the Gate of Dawn? [shouts of "no"] However, they may force us out by use of arms—and how shall we react? No one knows on what day we may have to react. That is why we must discuss this ahead of time.

We have already had some attacks. We have some occupied pieces of Lithuania, consisting not only of those bases and garrisons, as was the case earlier, but also of the occupied television and radio building, the occupied schools, and the press building. There is a very strong weapon in existence, which we have learned during the years of Sajudis—the weapon of peaceful resistance. When people armed with the spirit of heroes confront a massive armed force—people who do not retreat even in the face of death, and are even prepared to die—then the arms are withdrawn, even though they have deprived us of those near and dear to us. Thus, this weapon is strong and it can overcome the greatest army of an empire. [passage omitted]

We have a lot to clarify among ourselves. We will not discuss everything here today, we will discuss things with the family, among neighbors, at work. [passage omitted] Furthermore, we should be careful lest we be led astray, because law is the foundation of a state. Moreover, will we be understood, not only among ourselves, but throughout the world, especially? If we had decided, as was proposed by some, that the socialist revolution did well, we would not have been understood; on the other hand, in acknowledging the state right and the right of its citizens, we must also concern ourselves also with harmony and agreement, and we must strive to have the desires and interests of the people [words indistinct]. To understand that the current period is very important, that if we implement those changes in Lithuania, we will truly become a different state, not a Soviet state. To accomplish this, however, we will have to face many difficulties, both actual ones among us and some specially fabricated ones. That is why we must be both citizens and neighbors and develop within ourselves a feeling for our neighbor, a feeling of solidarity, and an understanding of others.

I have mentioned the attacks that threaten us from outside forces—from the other country and the foreign army deployed in Lithuania. The army carries out commands. If an order is given to lie, even the generals lie, and can then go further. Moreover, currently, this spring, the question of our young men again looms before us. The young men, who—and especially their parents are being thratened, frightened and terrorized—they wish to draft recruits for that foreign army. Previously, we urged them not to go, but we said that after all, perhaps it would be possible not to exacerbate the situation. Furthermore, if someone wanted to go of his own free will, as if entering some sort of foreign legion, to serve somewhere, perhaps let that become a question for him or his parents to decide.

Today, however, this army is committing acts of violence against Lithuania. It is also being employed against other freedom-seeking nations. Thus, must we not tell our young men: "No, young man. [shouts of approval and applause] Then, we must also tell ourselves as well, regarding that young man, how we are going to defend him—that all, all families will help, if the need to go into hiding arises, they will take him away if he needs to be taken away, since many unarmed people constitute a great force and a great [word indistinct]. Moreover, we are aware that dangers may arise, or questions may arise, of how much [illegible] going to endure without showing resistance and finally, not retrieving that which is ours? There are means of resistance—of a state, of justice. We have our system of law protection, which has remained loyal to Lithuania. We also have a type of means of state resistance, such as the use of force, whenever our militia, our police, or our state protection officials come face to face with banditry. It is of no importance whether these bandits are in or out of uniform. [applause]

A similar question does exist, we can resist and we were determined—our soldiers and our volunteers took an oath at the Supreme Council building that January night, that they would not retreat even if it meant giving up their lives. [prolonged applause]. We are also aware that our adversaries, however—first of all, our political, ideological adversaries and the enemies of the state—are not after all those little soldiers, who have not all become like wild beasts, or have been filled with some drug tablets, who simply—simply are ordered to go against unarmed people and who themselves clutch their own heads in despair, while another even may toss his weapon aside. These adversaries, however, would like to see bloodshed on both sides. [passage omitted]

We may imagine, we may consider, and we may ask even today, if the need arises, will we come—a thousand unarmed people—to free our television building? Gentlemen, is it not time? [applause and shouts of approval]. Moreover, if an armed gang is permitted to rampage in the streets of our city, to attack the police, to fire shots into streets full of people—if it does not cease and is not withdrawn from Lithuania—will we come in tens of thousands of unarmed people, near that nest? [applause and long shouts of approval] Of course we will come, but we will come when the need arises, when we are called. [applause]

Such actions are not needed, as in recent days, when one of our young men—whose nerves apparently, had given out, grabbed an OMON [special purpose militia detachment] member by the lapels, on the street—that is unnecessary. Let them [word indistinct] disdain, let them feel like strangers and outcasts from our society and from our life. Perhaps, some of them may yet have a change of mind.

Another question—what if a new blockade should come? What if they try to crush us by economic difficulties and of course, what they are hoping for—unemployment will arise among the people—trouble—many of those dissatisfied and then perhaps their [word indistinct] may be more successful. Our borders will be closed, and we will not be able to turn to the world, in the course of normal trade and labor relations, if an iron curtain it to be closed to the west and to the south, while strangulation is to come from the east, will we come by the hundred thousand to reclaim our borders? [shouts and prolonged applause]. This is what we must think about, since a time of fracture may be approaching, after all.

We have endured a difficult year marked by sacrifices, and the world is inclining to make a positive decision. The policy of the great states, regarding the Baltic countries, has changed; different speeches can be heard, at times, even in the capital of the East. [passage omitted]

We want to have a Lithuania where everyone can feel at ease—people of all nationalities, who speak in various languages, who are people of goodwill, and who desire to be loyal citizens and to establish an independent and flourishing Lithuania with us. [applause] [passage omitted]

We hope, having assembled together, as we have today, that no one will question this, anywhere—Lithuania will not retreat. [prolonged applause]

Resolution Read at Rally

LD0505014991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1725 GMT 4 May 91

[Sajudis Seimas Council resolution read by Sajudis Seimas Council Chairman Juozas Tumelis at a rally in Vingis Park in Vilnius—live]

[Text] Today the nation's will and determination are again present here.

Today we, the great Seimas of all Lithuania, are present here.

We have assembled here today, and we proclaim: We have supported and will continue to support the legislature we elected by our free elections. [applause] If we fail to do this, the colloborator Lithuanian Government will be upheld by Soviet tanks.

We have assembled here today and we proclaim: No intimidations or intrigues by Moscow; current or future economic blockades will not be able to divide us and will not force us to renounce our principal goal. [applause]

We have assembled here today and proclaim: Lithuania is on the threshold of difficult but imperative political, economic, and social changes. They must be implemented, not only by the legislature and the Government of Lithuania, but also by all of us. Moreover, just like during the first days of Sajudis, we must help ourselves in the solution of this problem. We must help with our individual initiative, patience, and understanding.

The fate of every one of us and also the fate of our Lithuania depend on this. That is [words indistinct].

Council Chairman Tumelis Issues Appeal

LD0505013691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1728 GMT 4 May 91

[Appeal read by Sajudis Seimas Council Chairman Juozas Tumelis at a rally in Vingis Park in Vilnius—live]

[Text] On 4 May 1991, having assembled in Vilnius at a 200,000-strong gathering, called together by the Lithuanian Sajudis, we appeal to you once again—leaders of the world's nations and legislators, democratic parties and movements, and all people of goodwill.

Remember that Lithuania, which has been occupied and annexed by the USSR for 50 years, on 11 march 1990 proclaimed the Act of the Restoration of its Independent State. The state that occupied us, however, is delaying the interstate negotiations and is creeping into Lithuania, by way of a new occupation. (?Roundups) are being sanctioned of our sons being seized into a foreign army; announced and unannounced economic blockades are being carried out. We are also in sight of other aggressions.

The problem of Lithuania and of the other Baltic states is not an internal problem of the USSR; however, this is barely beginning to be comprehended in the world. By being passive observers of the events in Lithuania, you may become witnesses of great new criminal actions. The unresolved Baltic problems, by your silence or maybe only indecision—excuse me—indecisive concurrence, can only encourage the occupier toward new actions.

The problems of the Baltic states can not be resolved without us, or in silence, behind closed doors, since that is reminiscent of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact and its secret protocols. This problem is the [word indistinct] affair of the whole world and also our affair.

Our political and civic determination are unshakable. For this reason, we demand that the affairs of Lithuania be deliberated within the United Nations, that Lithuania be legally returned to the United Nations and all international organizations, and that the world express its position publicly and unambiguously regarding the Baltic states.

We trust in your goodwill.

Lithuania Seeks Neutrality, Good Relations

LD0605115491 Berlin ADN in German 1009 GMT 6 May 91

[Text] Vilnius (ADN)—Lithuania wants to become a neutral state, said its prime minister, Gediminas Vagnorius, in an interview with ADN today. The reestablishment of the independent Lithuanian state remains his government's prime objective. "How quickly we will succeed in attaining this goal depends in many ways on the negotiations with the Soviet Union and on the policies of the West toward the USSR and Lithuania," the head of government said. "We are situated between West and East, we have to become a neutral state."

His government is making efforts to join the European Council, Vagnorius said. In addition, Lithuania wants to take an active part in the work of the Nordic Council and cooperate closely with all neighboring states. In the field of economics, the government in Vilnius is working toward the introduction of a market economy. "There is no other system that could save us," Vagnorius said. "In the second half of this year Lithuania will begin to live under the conditions of a market economy. By next year one-half of all enterprises will be privatized."

The prime minister said the months ahead will be the "most complicated time" for the Lithuanians and the "most difficult and unpopular time" for his government. He is hoping, however, that the Lithuanian economy can be stabilized by the end of the year. The precondition for this is that relations with the Soviet Union are not disturbed.

Lithuania Greets Latvian Independence Anniversary

LD0505020291 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 4 May 91

[Text] Lithuania's neighbor Latvia is celebrating the first anniversary of the restored independent Republic of Latvia today. The Lithuanian legislature has sent congratulations to the Latvian legislature, which proclaimed the restoration of the independent Latvian state one year ago.

It is noted in the greeting: Our related nations are currently brought even closer together by common difficulties and dangers—the same determination to become free of the Soviet empire, and the blood of unarmed patriots spilled on the streets of Vilnius and Riga in January of this year. Following the painful days of our mourning, may there dawn an enduring freedom. God bless Latvia!

Soldiers Attack Photographer Outside Vilnius Base

LD0305145191 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] According to a report by the SAJUDIS INFORMATION AGENCY, an incident took place this evening near the Vilnius military base known as the Northern Townlet.

Three Moscow residents were holding a picket demonstration near the base entrance. The group consisted of a member of the Moscow Mothers' Committee and of two young men who accompanied her, who [word indistinct] were part of the Russian Democratic Movement.

The woman was carrying a banner with a mothers' of soldiers appeal. While [words indistinct] was trying to film this picket action, approximately 10 soldiers ran out of the base and attempted to take his video camera from him. [word indistinct] was defended by some passers-by and succeeded in hiding himself, but the photographer was beaten up and has been taken to the hospital to obtain needed medical assistance.

RSFSR

Yeltsin, Kryuchkov Discuss RSFSR KGB

LD0505114691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1128 GMT 5 May 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow, 5 May (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin, head of the Russian legislature, and Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB, held discussions today on the protocol of an accord on setting up the KGB of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR].

Their meeting, which took place at the RSFSR House of Soviets, began with a private conversation. They were then joined by representatives of the Russian Government and legislature and the Union KGB.

According to Sergey Stepashin, chairman of the Committee on Security of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, "No serious contradictions arose during the discussions." Sergey Stepashin also disclosed that the signing of the protocol should take place tomorrow morning.

Agreement Outlined

LD0505131591 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 5 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—President of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin and chairman of the All-Union State Security Committee Vladimir Kryuchkov today discussed a protocol of understanding on the establishment of the state security committee in the Russian Federation.

They initially had a one-to-one meeting at the building of the Russian parliament. Later, they were joined by representatives of the Russian government and parliament as well as by KGB officers of the all-Union committee.

According to chairman of the Russian parliament Committee on Defence and Security Sergey Stepashin, "No serious contradictions arose during the discussions. Stepashin also said that the protocol would be signed tomorrow morning.

In an interview with reporters, he said that, according to a preliminary agreement, the Russian state security committee will not be limited in its number. Stepashin noted that the committee will initially consist of 350-400 officers.

He said that the committee and the all-Union KGB would operate jointly in some areas, including intelligence and counter-intelligence.

In addition, the protocol provides for establishing a commission with the participation of both sides to work out a document on the delineation of powers and functions between the two committees.

The final version of the document will be adopted right after the signing of a new union treaty.

Stepashin said that the presidium of the Russian parliament would discuss, later in the day, the establishment of a committee on defence and a committee on state security of the Russian Federation, instead of the present State Committee on Defence and Security of the Russian Federation.

Career KGB officer, Major General Viktor Ivanenko, 44, will be recommended for the post of head of republican KGB. "We shall not be in a hurry with appointing" a permanent KGB chief, Stepashin stressed.

Ivanenko Appointed Acting Chief

LD0505151591 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 15 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Yuriy Kozmin and Andrey Surzanskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—The Presidium of the Russian parliament today appointed Viktor Ivanenko as acting chief of the republican State Security Committee (KGB). Until recently, Ivanenko has worked as deputy head of the USSR State Security Committee's Inspectorate.

The 44-year-old major-general sees the main functions of the State Security Committee, which is being formed in Russia now, in ensuring comprehensive control over the situation in the Russian Federation, in combatting organised crime and halting anti-constitutional activity in the republic.

In an interview with Soviet journalists, Ivanenko noted that in addition to the aforementioned functions, Russia's state security bodies would also work to ensure interaction with various political parties.

On the relationship with the Federal State Security Committee, Ivanenko said that "they should be built within the framework of law and the latter should not have contradictory elements."

The final decision to set up the Russian KGB was agreed upon during today's meeting between Russian parliament leader Boris Yeltsin and USSR KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov.

Yeltsin Interviewed on Kuzbass Visit

LD0405204391 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1645 GMT 4 May 91

[Studio interview with Boris Yeltsin, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet chairman, by correspondent Rasul Mikhailov in Moscow; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Mikhailov] Boris Nikolayevich, you have recently returned from a trip to Kuzbass. What were the reasons for the trip and what was it like? Had this trip been part of your plans at all?

[Yeltsin] Yes, there were reasons, Rasul Kazbekovich. First of all, I have always thought that personal contacts with people in various areas sometimes bring about much more benefit than working out some sort of solutions here, in a comfortable office. Another thing is that there can never be too many trips around Russia. There is always a shortage of such trips in Russia, and always will be. Third, and this is of course the most important thing, Kuzbass is, in fact, a special region, the one where the workers' movement has been expanding most powerfully. In this respect, it has become a kind of testing ground, or center. To keep in permanent contact with the miners, as well as with the working movement in general, I think, means to verify your own intentions and to check what you are doing.

You know that for two months now a most complex strike has been going on, and Kuzbass is one of the main strike regions. This means that the tension there is also at its highest. After the emergency Third Congress of Peoples' Deputies, the organs of power in Russia, as well as the rest of the country, have been holding talks with striking collectives. According to a decision by the congress, an interlegislative group was set up, as had been suggested, and our own legislative group joined it to coordinate all issues connected with the demands of the miners, and, indeed, other collectives. By the end of April, part of this work was completed, but in order to finally check it someone had to go there and finalize things, and sign with them a document in which measures are set out in detail, and a mechanism of their transfer to Russia, as well as all kinds of economic, financial, and tax-related incentives. This was done.

I signed this document on 1 May. Prior to the signing of this directive Yuriy Vladimirovich Skokov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, met with virtually every work force and worked out agreements with them and signed those agreements which specifically spell out all the economic demands which are accepted by Russia on the transfer of the mines to its jurisdiction.

That was the main reason. But there was yet another reason for me to fly out immediately, right at that time. This was the meeting the supreme leaders of nine republics held with the country's president on 23 April. As you yourself know from the comments of viewers and listeners, reactions to the meeting were mixed.

Some of the questions which were raised were addressed to me. I received a telegram from the miners. They asked me to explain what had happened, if they were not to decide that this was a powerful blow against the workers' movement. Therefore, I decided that the best thing would be to explain everything on the spot, rather than invite the miners to come here. So, that was also a reason.

[Mikhailov] Judging by what you have just said, you managed to familiarize yourself in quite some detail with the present situation in the Kuzbass. What, in your view, is the situation regarding the strike movement, and the workers' movement in Russia as a whole?

[Yeltsin] I think you have touched on a very serious question, since the workers' movement is underestimated to a certan extent today. Some sections of the mass media are even distorting the meaning of the workers' movement furthermore, the workers are being blamed for all the difficulties which there are today, regarding the progress of the economic reform, the state of the economy, and people's living standards. Today the workers' movement in the Kuzbass and in Russia, throughout the country in fact, is undergoing a dramatic upsurge—and not just in the narrow context of a movement of workers. An increasing number of people in various professions—teachers, doctors, engineers, and even scientific workers—are adopting active social positions. Today, maybe, there are not hundreds of thousands taking part in this movement, but millions.

It is important that (?in a real environment) people's solidarity appears. They quickly find a common language, as it were, and work out a single position. I don't think there is any need to explain to you, the viewers, how important this is.

There is an important feature: the increased degree of organization in the current workers' movement on the scale of the region, and on the scale of the republic, and even on the scale of the whole country.

And another thing: the workers' movement today is not only a self-defense movement to protect their economic and political rights. The creative potential of the workers' movement is being revealed more and more. Quite a lot of untruths have sprung up around the strike, yet it is precisely the organized nature of the miners' workforces that has in fact made it possible to maintain the industry in working order up to today. This is very important also for the possibility of a speedy restoration of a normal working rhythm. During the time of the strike the creation of an autonomous system, independent of the ministry, for ensuring their survival has in effect been started for related industries, and it has been able to demonstrate its effectiveness. It is possible that this is in fact a prototype for self-management: We are looking for ways of doing this, and have not yet managed to find them in theory, yet in practice life prompts us to believe that this will probably be the best self-management system in the collective, or in some organization.

It is important that both the scope of the strikes in the country and the well-organized way in which they were held became one of the chief reasons the offensive by reactionary forces was broken. Precisely at the time when reactionary forces, right-wing forces, started to rise, at the same time, as a kind of counterbalance to them, this workers' movement started to rise. It largely determined the fact that the situation changed. The miners, workers, citizens of Russia, demonstrated that they are not going to go back.

[Mikhailov] Boris Nikolayevich, you have already said today that one of the main questions of interest and concern to the miners was the president's meeting with the leaders of nine Union republics. The significance of this statement is complex, as the press commented, and it was received in a complex way by the inhabitants of the RSFSR. I would like to hear your comment.

[Yeltsin] In one question you seem to have included about five.

I am convinced that a great event has taken place. The meeting of the top leaders of the republics, of nine republics, and the president of the country, could mark the beginning of a real improvement of the internal political situation of the country—and of course of Russia, too—without which radical economic reform is impossible in any one of the republics or in the country.

Personally, I continue to believe that if mutual understanding is achieved with the Union leadership and with the leaderships of the Union republics, if we all move in the same direction, the direction of radical reform, this will be the best road for the development of the Russian Federation—provided all sides adhere strictly to the undertakings they have given.

During the nine and one-half hours that the meeting lasted, we managed to make substantial progress in bringing closer the positions of the leaders of the republics and the leader of the center, the country's president. A compromise was reached which now makes it possible to carry out reform in conditions of agreement on the main questions rather than confrontation and showdown. To illustrate my point, I can tell you that after nine and one-half hours only 20 percent remained of the original document that was proposed. Everything will be reworked, along the lines of the proposals made by the leaders of the republics. After that it was signed. What did we manage to agree on? It was recognized that the role of the republics in the Union had substantially changed. Today these are sovereign states which run their own policy. That was declared for the first time. Never before has the country's president accepted that formula. In other words, this is, in effect, recognition of the sovereignty of states, of these nine states. That was a concession.

I am certain that if this had been recognized a year ago, we would not now have the profound crisis that exists presently. We have lost a lot of time precisely because they simply did not want to recognize that the center must shift toward the republics—or sovereign states—and that the center must hand over some of its powers and only take on those which the republic themselves voluntarily cede to it.

We also agreed that the new union must, in fact, be a union of sovereign states which have voluntarily formed a union. This is a very fundamental point, which has not been noted by everybody. The Union treaty is not to be foisted on the republics from above, but this process will take place from below. When we discussed this a year ago, we were unable to reach agreement. But when we signed this declaration, everybody agreed that we would make our proposals on the Union treaty, first of all in the form of proposals adopted by supreme soviets, and then in some kind of unifying document, especially as five republics, including ourselves, have achieved virtually 100 percent agreement. To be more precise, we agree on 99 percent of the treaty's text.

For the first time it was recognized that Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Moldova, Georgia, and Armenia must decide for themselves the question of joining the Union treaty, without any pressure—in other words, without the army. After all, there have been attempts to apply pressure on the Baltic republics and certain others. It was recognized that this is their business. They can decide it for themselves. This was also an admission.

At the same time, the republics which signed the Union treaty get most-favored status in relations with each other, first and foremost economic ones. Economic relations with republics which do not join the union will be built on world prices, or on mutually agreed conditions.

The meeting again admitted for the first time that the state and Union bodies need to be subjected to real change. The president had never admitted it, but here at this meeting he admitted that, yes, the Union bodies cannot exist in the form that they have today if we are to embark on a genuine political reform, an economic reform, to renew society. He said that in practice the administrative-command system is not being dismantled, although six years have already passed, and he said that after the signing of the Union treaty the adoption of a new constitution would follow six months later, with the election of people's deputies, the election of Union bodies, and complete reorganization. That's to say, getting rid of that heavy crown of the administrative-command system that weighs down on everyone—and national elections for the new president of the country, if this is envisaged in the Constitution.

The idea of a state of emergency, or of direct presidential rule, was categorically rejected by all the leaders of the nine republics. A state of emergency in the current conditions would only sharply aggravate the situation, and risk mass civil disobedience. Instead of order this would lead to chaos. To speak to the people from a position of strength is simply unacceptable today. This would simply be political madness.

At the same time, it is essential that joint anticrisis measures be carried through decisively. I want to stress this: not ones nurtured in Union offices and foisted on the republics, but jointly agreed-upon anticrisis measures. That is to say, each republic conducts its own economic policy. Russia now has an economic program. We want all the republics to coordinate their economic actions as quickly as possible, to draw up common approaches, so that this inter-republican anticrisis program, as it were, can be put into effect. This program would provide for radical measures to heal the economy. But it would also indicate ways of correcting those flagrant mistakes committed by the Union Government, above all the price reform which has quite simply bankrupted the majority of Russian families. We agreed that the five percent sales tax on prime necessities must be rescinded in the very near future, and subsequently applied only to a narrow range of luxury goods. All of us were in agreement on this.

The need to adopt measures within two weeks to compensate for price rises in school and student canteens, to lower the costs of railway transportation, and of road and air transportation, and other measures was admitted. Within a month a decision should be adopted on the indexation of incomes. This is what is being demanded by the working class and by the trade unions.

I think the viewers in Russia are also interested in the question of the position of the president of the country during these talks, since not everything we agreed on was reflected in the joint statement.

I consider that in such conditions the great powers enjoyed by the president of the country should be used to implement the joint actions agreed upon among the republics. Here you may well want to ask me a question: How is one to understand the fact that I signed the statement of 23 April when shortly before, on 19 February, I had been talking of the president's resigning?

I consider that this is logical and, when I spoke about this to the miners, they accepted it with understanding. There was at that time great pressure from the rightwing forces, some of them had come out of their trenches, so to say, and they had started to drag the president of the country along behind them—I'd put it like that, and not the other way round. So this extreme, perhaps even harsh measure, which was chosen—my demand for the resignation of the president—is a sort of warning to him: If events develop in the future in the same way, if there is an attack from the right wing, then we in the republic will take affairs into our own hands.

After that things will happen, the workers' movement, the strike movement, will deploy. That's to say, the progressive forces will deploy. The president, too, has reconsidered a number of his positions during that time, since February and March. Taking all this into account, it was possible to gather this grouping together and sign such a statement. Only under these circumstances. I don't see anything illogical here, although the president was seriously criticized by practically every republican leader—and I didn't get away without being criticized either—and was quite severely criticized, and they said straight out that really this is your last chance. That's to say, if you carry out our coordinated agreements, then fine, let's act. If you don't, then we shall make things happen our way.

People ask me: How can you trust him since you have already met together, just you two, and unfortunately your agreements were not always implemented? Nevertheless, you must take the difference here into account, since there there were just the two of us, and here we were 10, including nine top leaders of the republics. So now to refuse to carry out our mutual agreements somehow is quite impossible, I think.

Well, if he tries that, we also have our own alternative up our sleeve.

We agreed that such meetings should be continued by way of monitoring, that is to say, an agreement was reached to have similar meetings all the time. The statement does not mention many questions of fundamental importance on which agreement in principle was also reached. Apart from, let's say, the recognition of the sovereignty of the states, a decision was reached to embark immediately on a mechanism to give a clear demarcation of functions and ownership between the republics and the center. Then, I have already said that the actual system of the Union treaty and the way it is concluded is, so to say, being turned on its head, or rather the other way round, being turned the right way up, since it is the Union republics which are to submit the draft treaties, and not what is now being foisted on us.

An accord on the currency. An accord on the gold reserves. An accord on what is for us extremely important. There is not one collective where this question is not being asked: an accord on transferring the general licensing for their products to the republics. Instead of having to go every time for each 1,000 cubic meters of timber or whatever to Pavlov's office. The Union bodies are here and for months to have to go and ask for something. Well, and a number of other agreements were reached on a number of other matters, and I repeat that this is an agreement between the president of the country and the highest leaders—nine of the highest leaders—of the republics. This is very important and I think it is quite feasible for us to carry out that decision together.

[Mikhailov] Boris Nikolayevich, I'd like to come back to the declaration of the ten, as there are many questions on that position, such a position as the special situation, the special regime, as it were: What is this actually, and will it not undermine the confidence of the labor collectives in the Russian leadership?

[Yeltsin] I have to say that now, at the meeting in the Kuzbass, there were many such questions. Well, that is quite understandable. The suggestion was even made there of not a special regime, but a state of emergency. Well, we opposed that, and this phrase, "special regime" appeared. But how do I, for example, understand this special regime? A special regime is a regime with most-favored status. It is, first of all, an incentive to work. It is the revision of various benefits, financing, taxes. They have priority, these industries, for deliveries of various components and materials. Only after that comes discipline, order. That's how I see it, and in view of the fact that we're reached agreement that this will be enshrined in a special decree and obligatorily agreed with each republic, we do have grounds to believe that without our endorsement he won't sign the decree. We won't endorse it if it envisages any measures that are not supported by the working class and by the strike committees.

[Mikhailov] During your trip to Kuzbass, an agreement with the striking miners was achieved. What are the basics of this agreement?

[Yeltsin] The basics consist in defining specific ways and mechanisms of transition, in the coal industry to begin with, into the jurisdiction of Russia. This was the most important point. The task was not to supply it with a new, Russian, boss. No. We want, so to speak, to skip over one bureaucratic step. From a bureaucratic subordination within the Union, straight into the jurisdiction of Russia, at the same time giving coal enterprises, essentially, full independence. Their relations with state bodies of administration, as well as local government bodies, will be only fulfilled through economic levers. Through a precise system of taxes mainly, and nothing else. This order may be extended to the enterprises in adjoining industries, including power engineering, transportation, construction, and so on.

As I say, I signed the order on 1 May. The miners and I settled it in in the following way: On the basis of this order, an agreement should be signed between the Russian Council of Ministers and the Cabinet of Ministers of the Union. Well, I have sensed in your question yet another one: whether they are actually going to go back to work after May.

[Mikhailov] Yes.

[Yeltsin] You see, it is a very serious question. A psychological one. When I was going there, I did not, by any means, consider it my task to make any conditions for them on their return to work, or even the signing of any agreement on this subject, or, indeed, any appeal to them to this effect. I think it was they who announced the strike. Our business is to solve the issues that they set as conditions. We think that we have solved most of the issues. On some of them, there are still a few steps to be made. As to the way out of the strike—it is for them to decide. No pressure should be put on them, in any case.

Yeltsin Issues Instructions on Management Changes

LD0305172291 Moscow TASS in English 1702 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 3 TASS—Chairman of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin issued an instruction today on changes of economic management conditions of enterprises of the coal industry and other basic industries on the territory of the Russian Federation. It says that the transfer of enterprises of those industries to the jurisdiction of Russia on the decision of their labour collectives means the granting to them of full economic independence, including the choice of the form of ownership and economic management.

The Russian Council of Ministers has been instructed in this connection to form independent inter-branch structures, creating for them optimal conditions for the stabilisation of work, development and the creation of a network of small enterprises, and not to allow the interference of local authorities, "not based on Russian laws", in the work of economically independent enterprises of the above mentioned industries, that went over to the jurisdiction of Russian authorities. "It should be fixed that relations between them are to be formed only on an economic basis through the system of financial taxes or taxes paid in kind in the order, set by the Russian parliament," the instruction says.

The instruction envisages the introduction at coal industry enterprises of the new practices of the organisation of export deliveries and export account-settling within the set quotas. This includes the granting of the right to licensing and the maximum use of foreign currency revenues for the socio-economic development of enterprises.

Yeltsin Views Strike, Constitution Issues

LD0505081591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1139 GMT 4 May 91

[Question and answer session with Russian President Boris Yeltsin at meeting of Kuzbass strike committees council in Novokuznetsk on 29 April; where noted, Yeltsin reads out questions himself—recorded]

[Text] [Yeltsin, reading a question] The situation that has developed today in the foreign economic activities of the country bears no criticism. How do you evaluate Russia's foreign trade, what share from the produced goods should remain with the working collectives and the regions to which it should belong?

[Yeltsin replies] This should be a differentiated process, I said this to you last time. The coal collectives ask us to leave them all their 100 percent for the first two years. You know that we could not manage 100 percent or 80 percent, but in principle if we are to talk seriously, no less than 50-60 and up to 70 percent should be left for the working collectives. And the foreign economic activities should be mainly aimed at the Rusian Federation. About the low esteem of the collectives' leaders, their appointment from above—I agree.

[Reads question] What is your attitude toward those miners' collectives which during the strike were busy solving their economic problems, i.e. were not on strike, and now want to ride on this wave and get what the strikers were demanding for years, and so on?

[Replies] I think, I do not want to reproach [changes thought] please, sort it out yourselves, yes, sort it out yourselves, what the attitude toward such collectives should be.

[Reads question] In the town of Novokuznetsk, a shortage of truthful information can be sensed, on the work of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet.

[Replies] Well, it is not just in the town of Novokuznetsk. There is, of course both disinformation, and a shortage of information. It is true about, well, it is more or less OK in the European. (?part of Russia), while all of this area suffers greatly from this lack of information. But we are increasing both the circulation of all editions of the ROSSISKAYA GAZETA and of the ROSSIYA newspaper. And on 12 May, the Russian Television Company will start working permanently.

It is true that we reached a point at which we just went and decided to hand the Russian flag alongside the Soviet one on the Ostankino tower. How could it be otherwise? It is the capital both of the Union and of Russia. On 12 May we will have Russian Television there, so the Russian flag should hang there. Well, (?so we made them do it). In three hours time, a supreme level instruction follows: Remove the Russian flag.

[Reads question] When is the army going to get rid of the party committees, and when will other enterprises do the same?

[Replies] Well, the issue of departyization is one of your political demands. I mean, those of the striking collectives. I must say quite frankly that I have got a draft instruction here. Unsigned. I want to do it in the following way: Today I am going to make it public by reading it out to you from beginning to end. As for signing it, let me discuss it with you—when should it be signed? Because you understand, 12 June lies ahead.

[Reads draft] On the activities of political parties and movements within state bodies and organizations: In order to prevent unjustified interference in the activities of state bodies and organizations as well as negative results of the confrontation of political parties and movements, to insure normal functioning of the state apparatus, and following Article 6 of the Constitution which excludes monopolism by any single party, I hereby decree:

First: to stop the activities of any party organizations and public political movements, including primary organizations, committees, groups, and others, within the organs of the supreme bodies of state power, including the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, republican government bodies, law enforcement, internal affairs, state security and procuracy organs, as well as respective structures at lower levels. The possibility of activities of party organizations and any other public political movements at state enterprises, institutions and other organizations is to be decided by the labor collective of the enterprise, organization, or institution. This point's demand does not include the activities of deputies' party and other organizations within the soviets of people's deputies.

Second: The personnel of state organs and organizations named in Point 1 of the present resolution must be guided in their professional activity only by the demands of the Constitution and the laws of Russia and the USSR, within the scope of their competence. Their actions must not contradict the decisions of their management, and no political parties may interfere in them. That is, management must not fulfill decisions made by political bodies so far as their enterprises are concerns, [word indistinct] the movement's objectives, nor any of their representatives' instructions. The participation of such workers in the activities of political parties and movements is permitted only in their own free time and outside the scope of state bodies, enterprises, and organizations.

The participation or non-participation of citizens in the activities of political parties and movements cannot be a basis for restrictions on their rights, including the right to hold any post, unless there is any evidence to suggest [word indistinct] otherwise.

Fourth [as heard], in other words, any leader of the republic can be a person who is not a member of a party. There should be no restrictions at all. Any other course of action is illegal.

The relevant commissions of the Russian Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the procuratorate, the supreme soviets of republics belonging to the RSFSR, the soviets of people's deputies of krays and oblasts in Russia, the Moscow and Leningrad soviets, and the soviets of people's deputies of autonomous oblasts and okrugs are to insure that this decision is implemented and that its execution is supervised. The requirements of paragraph [words indistinct] of this decision also apply to the officers and men of units and detachments of forces, organs and services of the Union Armed Forces, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and KGB, including special purpose detachments, and other paramilitary formations that are wholly or partially, permanently or temporarily, stationed on Russian territory.

Well, as for the date for signing—let us give that some thought. [words indistinct]

[Unidentified voice] Why, having been deceived by Gorbachev more than once, did you confide in him again? Will not the fate of the statement repeat the fate of the 500 days program?

[Yeltsin] You see, we met each other face to face every time. We, or rather I, had no proof that he was deceiving me. But now the (?nine) highest leaders of nine republics, or rather sovereign states, and if there is only one, any, deception or any turn, you see, [word indistinct] in decision adopted by us, then we have warned him, that is your last chance, that is it. We will go away and sign the Union treaty ourselves without the center at all.

[Reads question] Will the command structure for the enterprises transferred to the jurisdiction of Russia be created in Russia or will they be consistently assured of market independence?

[Replies] Such structures, very small, will be created only for some coordination and they will not be given, so to speak, any management and command functions. In this we, Skokov and I, are giving you a guarantee. In this respect there will be no bosses above you. There will be an economic treaty between you and us and tax—these are all the relations. (?As for the rest, you will be independent.)

[Reads Question] Why, in your view, even in spite of events in the Baltics, does Gorbachev's primacy remain in the West?

[Replies] Well, I think, it has been shaken seriously after the Baltics and I have observed this. All the same, euphoria has declined considerably. Though, of course, some of it still remains.

[Reads question] Why were the demands for removal of party influence in the army, the Ministry for Internal Affairs, the KGB, public education, and (?bodies) of power not reflected in the statement?

[Replies] Because not only the president but many others are also concurrently secretaries of the central committee.

Social Democrats Nominate Yeltsin for Presidency

LD0305144291 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] Leningrad May 3 TASS—Delegates to Russia's Social Democratic Party's third congress which ended here today discussed the political situation in Russia and ways to get out of the crisis.

This political organisation with a membership of 5,600 nominated Boris Yeltsin as a candidate for Russia's presidency.

"We advocate spiritual revival of Russia and its return to the fold of the world civilisation. I am convinced that this mission will attract new members to our ranks," Leningrader Aleksandr Obolenskiy, one of the leaders of the Social Democrats, told TASS.

The subject of cooperation among Social Democrats of Europe was raised in a speech by one of foreign guests to the congress, Gert Weiskirchen, member of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and a deputy to the Bundestag.

"We welcome the emergence of such a party and we hope this movement will be mutually enriching to our peoples," he said.

It is important to turn the Social Democratic Party of Russia into a party of parliamentary type. Democracy in the Soviet Union can triumph only provided it triumphs in Russia, Weiskirchen believes.

Representatives of the Social Democrats from Austria, Denmark, Norway, France, and Sweden had been also invited to attend the congress.

Ryzhkov Decides To Run for Russian President

LD0505160591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1537 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 May (TASS)—Former USSR Council of Ministers Chairman Nikolay Ryzhkov will run for the office of president of Russia, according to a report today in IZVESTIYA.

Ryzhkov told a correspondent from the newspaper that he had given his consent after receiving many letters and telegrams from various parts of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic asking him to run as a candidate for the office of president of Russia. Before deciding he underwent a medical exam and came out of it convinced that his health is totally restored.

Prokofyev Report at Moscow Gorkom Plenum

PM0405194091 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 91 pp 1,2

[Report by Yu.A. Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Moscow CPSU City Committee (Gorkom), at 23 April Moscow Gorkom plenum]

[Text]

I.

Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee plenum meets tomorrow. Its purpose is to analyze the state of affairs in the country and in the party, devise political action tactics, and examine the anticrisis program. This is the plenum agenda that many party organizations in the country, including the Moscow City Party Organization, insisted on.

This is a manifestation of the acute dissatisfaction with the situation in the country, with the collapse of the economy, and with the political instability, and of a foreboding of the death of the state.

The demand for the convening of a Central Committee plenum was also brought about by Communists' mounting anger at the CPSU leadership's lack of a clear policy, their increasing alienation from the elaboration of party decisions, and the growing distance between primary organizations and the party leadership. Communists are simply bewildered, wondering why, at such critical moments in the country's life, Central Committee plenums are not held for months on end, Central Committee Politburo sessions are held only occasionally, and the meetings of its Secretariat fail to examine problems of paramount importance.

Communists' extreme vexation at the party leadership's apparent inactivity is clearly discernible in the calls for an immediate Central Committee plenum. The increasing calls for the removal of the general secretary are nothing but a reaction to the gulf between the words and deeds of perestroyka.

The Moscow CPSU City Committee [gorkom] plenum—as we agreed during the work of the gorkom commissions and at conferences of first secretaries of rayon committees [raykoms]—must today determine its own stance on the key questions of the country's and party's life so that it can be declared at the Central Committee plenum. The most difficult thing at the moment, it would appear, is to overcome excess emotion and adopt a constructive, businesslike attitude in this diffcult, very complex situation.

II.

The sociopolitical situation is extremely tense at the moment:

—most social groups are in a state of shock as a result of the abrupt and considerable increase in prices and the chronic emptiness of state stores against the backdrop of the wide range of goods available at expensive commercial and hard currency stores and Moscow markets;

—many enterprises are in danger of shutdown;

—our society's traditional ideals—remembrance of the past, feelings of comradeship and justice, friendship and good-neighborliness, love of the homeland and duty to it—have reached a state of total destruction;

—crime is increasing at an unprecedented rate as an inevitable consequence of the very acute economic crises.

These and other circumstances are aggravating an atmosphere in which people are experiencing psychological fatigue, in which they feel embittered and are unsure of themselves and those close to them.

Society cannot go on forever in that state and people cannot live like that any longer. The possibility of a social explosion is becoming a real one.

Not for nothing have there been demands in society of late for strong authority. It is talked about on both political flanks and it would appear that the center has started thinking about it, too.

It is clear now that perestroyka has reached an impasse. More and more one hears questions like: "What has caused the present situation?" "In whose interests is perestroyka being developed?" "Where is the way out of the present situation?"

III.

At our previous plenums, at the city party conference, and in the "Moscow Communists' Action Program" we analyzed in some detail the sources of the crisis afflicting society and the nature of our mistakes. Life confirms the correctness of the assessments and conclusions we have made in the past. They remain topical. Except that one must be even blunter about it today.

This is also prompted by the fact that the country's leadership does not always properly assess the situation and, consequently, does not always act properly. There is a feeling that both in the theory and practice of perestroyka we are trapped in a maze, too often encountering dead ends.

No one questions the need for the reform of all aspects of our life. Society's development definitely has slowed down and its spiritual and economic potential has not been exploited. The country desperately needed democratization, structural changes in the economy, and a genuine cultural rebirth of nations and ethnic groups.

But, again, as has happened in our past, the path taken was one of total destruction, in the vain hope it would then be easier to build something new. That is what the reforms amounted to. They were a political end in themselves, bereft of any clear goals. Consequently—as has happened before in Soviet history—the people were drawn into another experiment, which led to a major social and economic upheaval, and society is essentially on the brink of catastrophe. National economic ties that took years to establish have been destroyed. The number of victims of interethnic conflicts is increasing. The state is visibly crumbling.

Millions of people are now below the poverty line.

Is it not too high a price to pay, socially, for transformations? After all, when they launched perestroyka they intended to keep the cost to a minimum and the people were promised a rapid improvement in their life. That is why people believed the leadership of the party and the country and took up perestroyka. Has anyone any moral right to lead the country along a path of increasing hardship? The reforms which were taking shape and were giving the people so much hope can only be saved by decisively stabilizing the social, economic, and political situation.

This is not a sudden discovery of ours. We have been sounding the alarm for ages, but all we get in reply is assurances that perestroyka is developing properly.

Properly for whom?

It is now obvious that the process of restructuring our way of life is being more efficiently exploited by those who want to switch the country to the track of a different state and spocial system. Therefore the interests of the economic and political structures that in one way or another form the skeleton of the state are being deliberately infringed. The basic sectors of industry, the defense complex, agriculture, the army, and the state security system are under fire. There are plans to desovietize society. The ideology of diehard anticommunism is being actively fostered, under cover of talk about the deideologization and depoliticization of all aspects of life; this is not depoliticization, but repartyization. And this is typical of the entire strategy and tactics of those who have usurped the name "democrat."

By expressing the interests of the burgeoning class of entrepreneurs, the bourgeoisie, and accommodating life to it, they are putting massive pressure on the state's leading structures.

While the people are still in a daze, laws on the dismantling of state ownership and privatization of housing and trade and catering enterprises are being swiftly pushed through and premises are being sold off, often being taken away from children's play groups, sports sections, veterans' organizations, and libraries.

We cannot accept that sort of behavior. The CPSU is a party that expresses the interests of people of hired labor. We favor the establishment of equality of all forms of ownership and we are opposed to special conditions only for the entrepreneurial sector. The distortions that have crept in in recent years must be eliminated and it is necessary to create really healthy competition, rather than further undermine state enterprises, for which conditions of existence are being deliberately created which are tougher than the new forms of management that are taking shape.

But the main thing today is to halt the orgy of disintegration and to stabilize the economy by adopting decisive and vigorous anticrisis measures, emergency ones even.

IV.

We view the action program put forward by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers from precisely this angle.

Unfortunately, its draft was not published for broad discussion, but we have been able to acquaint a number of the gorkom members with its content on the eve of the plenum. Most people are familiar with the essence of the program from Comrade Pavlov's television address. It is essential to exchange opinions on this matter since the measures that are being proposed by the government will also be the subject of discussion at tomorrow's Central Committee plenum.

It is necessary to say outright that we cannot view this document as satisfactory.

It is a declarative document. It does not define the sequence of the implementation of the stages and measures to extricate the country from the crisis. The mechanism for the implementation of many measures is not explained, the reasoning is inadequate, and cogent calculations, including on the timeframe for the implementation of what is being proposed, are lacking.

Tactical tasks are not separated from the general strategic objectives of the government's actions.

Measures to stabilize the budget and balance revenue and expenditure are not outlined convincingly enough.

The sources of compensation for social costs are not disclosed. For example, the country is being prepared for unemployment, but no one is forecasting the expected number of unemployed either for the country as a whole, or for individual industries and economic regions.

It is not clear how much it will cost the budget to maintain an army of unemployed and retrain the workforce. Specialists have estimated that the number of unemployed, given a rigorous switch to market relations, could reach 45 to 50 million people.

Misgivings are evoked by measures such as forced privatization, the striving to hand over up to 10 percent of large-scale state property into private ownership.

The role of the state at various stages of the implementation of the proposed measures is not specified. Once again we have a program for whose implementation essentially no one is responsible.

Practical experience has shown that rigorous measures to stabilize the economy demand a certain amount of social and political stability with the simultaneous enhancement of executive power. This is acknowledged in the program, but no real mechanism to ensure that this happens is put forward.

In circumstances where six republics have in effect declared their withdrawal from the USSR, breaking off their economic ties, to ignore this situation virtually negates the program's main provisions, since its economic space is not defined.

A serious omission of the program is that it does not contain information on the country's foreign debt, on the deadlines for the repayment of credits, and on government measures to cover current and future debts.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers program makes provision for the granting of concessions to foreign partners. At the same time their mechanism is not stipulated. The country does not have precise legislation on prices for natural resources. And what is more, the outlook for an advantageous involvement of foreign capital in industries which the country really needs in the conditions of political and economical instability is itself dubious.

Practical experience has shown that foreign capital is being invested predominantly in the exploitation of the country's raw material resources and their exportation on terms which are highly disadvantageous to us. Under the simplified procedures for barter deals envisaged by the program, the uncontrolled exportation of strategic resources may assume a threatening scale.

A number of the program's points evoke serious misgivings from the viewpoint of the impact their implementation might have on the development of the crime situation. For example, taking a comprehensive view of measures such as the liberalization of prices, lifting of restrictions on the activities of trading cooperatives, and the authorization of private individuals and organizations to freely market "anomalous" stocks of food and consumer goods reveals that ultimately, rather than improving the situation on the consumer market, they may on the contrary exacerbate it and boost the activities of various kinds of criminal groupings.

The appendix to the program lists legislative acts and economic agreements subject to elaboration in the second quarter of this year. The need for adopting the majority of these laws is not in question, but it has to be borne in mind that their elaboration, and in particular their adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet, will obviously take a long time and will thus not promote a stabilization of the situation or emergence from the crisis.

V.

We are by no means only criticizing what others have done, without proposing anything ourselves.

We have our own vision of a range of urgent measures to prevent any further increase in the crisis and our own proposals on the country's development.

At the request of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom a group of academics and specialists drew up the policy document "Preventing Catastrophe and Ensuring Society's Development" published in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 28 March. This document is currently being discussed by party organizations and labor collectives, and not only in Moscow. On the whole, the document has been greeted positively by the party organizations of the Ukraine and a number of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] oblast party organizations. It is also supported by many Muscovites—who have naturally been making serious comments and proposals and demanding that things be made more specific, particularly in the economic sections.

I think that the main points of the program document to meet with support include:

—a relatively clear statement of strategic goals enabling the country to reclaim its place as one of the most developed and civilized states;

—reliance on our own cultural and historic experience, naturally with the utilization of everything that we need from world experience, but without the artificial imposition of foreign models in our country, where they could simply prove alien;

—the maintenance of continuity in the development and accumulation of potential, with the emphasis on leading-edge science and technology, leading enterprises, and the highly efficient areas that exist throughout the national economic complex;

—a new (for us) reading of the idea of statehood—utilizing the state as the "engine" of the system while simultaneously freeing the state from current economic functions, gearing it to strategy, and ensuring the population's social protection;

—combining modernization of the economy with the market mechanism, and ensuring equal rights for all citizens on the question of the denationalization of part of the state's property;

—a social policy based on the creation of equal opportunities for all groups of working people rather than just new entrepreneurs.

Obviously, it will be impossible to implement these program tasks without taking specific anticrisis steps in the very near future. In our opinion, we need to focus our efforts in the following areas of strengthening the state.

As a first step to prevent society sliding to disaster, we propose suspending all laws adopted by republics and regions which run counter to the USSR Constitution and laws adopted by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet. This should apply above all to the sphere of national economic management, finance, banking, taxation, communications, transportation, and the work of internal affairs organs and other functional structures. The people's will, expressed in the referendum for the preservation of the USSR as a federation of equal republics, should be carried out. All attempts to erode the USSR's foreign-currency funds, at a time when the USSR is on the brink of bankruptcy with all its consequences, should be stopped.

Second. It is necessary to ensure normal planning for national economic development. Without such planning it will be impossible to prevent crisis processes. All the programs submitted to society by both the USSR and RSFSR Governments ignore the planning question. This violates the logic of world economic development, whereby five-, three-, and one-year plans form the basis for ensuring the accelerated development of the newly industrialized countries, whose experience and living standard we can today invoke.

Third. It is necessary to urgently improve the tax system. The existing tax system provides no incentive for enterprises to engage in vigorous production activity, leads to their operations being undermined, and reduces output levels. The tax system should be changed and brought into line with the practice applied around the world when a country is emerging from a systemic crisis. A tax war is impermissible, as is any competition for the ownership of enterprises by setting preferential tax rates for them. Only those that are implementing priority goals to emerge from the crisis and demonstrating high efficiency can and should be given tax concessions.

Fourth. Foreign economic activity.

Currently the country is obliged to pay interest payments of 11.8 billion in foreign-currency rubles. Next year this figure could rise to 15 billion. This is a very grave situation given that total Soviet exports currently amount to 15 billion foreign-currency rubles a year. The decisions made by a number of republics—above all, the RSFSR—to promote the erosion of foreign-currency earnings and to allow foreign currency to be kept in any banks, including foreign banks, are absolutely unacceptable. The country might have to declare itself insolvent as a result of this process.

We need to switch to a policy of strict protectionism at the statewide level regarding all foreign economic activity. At the same time, the entire customs service should be brought under control and made directly subordinate to the USSR's supreme authority, and full control established over earnings paid into Soviet bank accounts.

Fifth. Material and technical supply. The crisis cannot be resolved outside a centralized system of distribution of material and technical resources, in the face of the very severe shortages in this sphere. In this situation, generated and exacerbated by the fall in production, the question of priority supplies to the life-supporting sectors is paramount.

Sixth. Control of the main export resources. Since the payment of the state debt is a question of the responsibility of the USSR as a single state, all the main export resources—oil, gold, gas, diamonds, and so on—must be strictly controlled by it. While the crisis is being resolved, the relevant structures must be put under the strict authority of the supreme executive authority of the USSR. Control of the distribution of foreign-currency income from exports is also needed.

Seventh. Food. For the first time in many years, the production of agricultural output has started to fall, and food reserves have decreased sharply. The future of the spring sowing and the fall harvest cannot be decided just by changing the forms of land tenure. That is obvious. We must restore price parity between agriculture and industry, or else over 80 billion rubles [R] extra will be removed from the countryside, which would lead either to the bankruptcy of a number of farms or to uncontrollable price rises.

With the aim of guaranteeing that the planned volumes of food are obtained, it is necessary to ensure that the agro-industrial complex is supplied with all the necessary resources for the food program.

Together with republic and local organs of power, the question of granting budget appropriations for the social reorganization of the countryside must be resolved.

In order to gain the peasant's interest, all restrictions on incentives for the labor of the agricultural producer must be lifted, and a maximum level of earnings ensured.

Eighth. Prices. The government price reform must obviously be acknowledged as unsatisfactory. The fall in the living standard of most of the country's population against a background of continuing social disintegration is absolutely impermissible. The price reform must be reexamined as soon as possible in order to ensure real protection for the population and change the logic behind the price rises, particularly on children's goods and basic necessities.

The social costs of the crisis must be equally distributed among all social strata.

Ninth. On strikes. It is necessary in a categorical manner to prevent all actions involving stopping production, if this is leading to a fall in the living standards of the majority of the country's citizens and undermining the national wealth which has been created over the decades.

It is necessary to declare a moratorium on strikes for the whole period in which the crisis process is being halted. At the same time, the state program to boost the basic sectors should be implemented.

Tenth. Overcoming the financial crisis. Wage increases greater than production output, concessions to demands not backed up by a real rise in labor productivity, the decline in discipline, and the rupture of links between enterprises and between regions are plunging the country into an acute financial crisis. The circulation of three types of money—cash, noncash, and foreign currency rubles—further compounds this. The financial crisis is perhaps the most serious, insofar as it threatens to completely undermine the entire system of commodity-money relations in the country, plunging it into the abyss of exchanges in kind, the black market, and in effect the devaluation of all its wealth. There should be one monetary unit in the country, one central state bank, and a single financial and credit policy.

It is possible that the only way out of the situation which has developed is a fundamental monetary reform. The reforms in our country in the postwar years and in Germany during the same period may serve as a model. Such a reform will not strike any extraordinary blow against the interests of the working masses.

Eleventh. Fulfillment of social programs in crisis conditions. It is necessary to provide a guaranteed minimum living wage to that group of the population with low incomes. It is necessary at all costs to guarantee the survival of the country's science, culture, education, and health care, which represent a real potential for the country's further development. To take it away from the country means to deprive it of a future. This is why we are putting to the legislative and executive organs the question of putting in order the centralized state mechanism for provision for these important areas of society's life. You cannot set about this task using so-called "donations from sponsorship" and charitable actions.

Twelfth. Defense of citizens' constitutional rights. Organized crime rules the roost in this country, with national clans cruelly suppressing dissidence, spilling the peaceable population's blood, driving entire peoples from the lands with impunity, selling off the country, and betraying national and state interests. There is no country in the world where such actions go unpunished. No state in the world would allow such desecration of its symbols as has gone on in the past few years in this country. No state in the world would allow the sovereignty of its laws to be infringed.

The state executive organs, headed by the country's president, should take stern, even emergency, measures to defend the constitutional system.

The proposed urgent measures do not signify a return to the previous economic management system. They are necessary to stop the crisis, to stabilize the economy for a period of time. At the same time a market infrastructure can develop. But the national economy's further development requires, first and foremost, stabilization, so that disaster does not strike the country.

VI.

Comrades!

It has already become obvious that extricating ourselves from the crisis and stabilizing the national economy is only possible under conditions whereby political pressure is lifted from the economy. It has literally been squashed by politics. Today, even such a question as whether or not to extract coal is considered not from the point of view of economic expediency, not from the point of view of people's interests, but from the standpoint of this or that circle's political gain.

We do not call into question the justice of the economic demands which the miners put forward, or the need to resolve the problem of fair remuneration for their labor and improved working and living conditions.

But it is impossible not to see that the miners are today being used as a political battering ram. Here no expense is spared. Millions of rubles are being released to whip up "strike fever." As NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA reported the other day, the Union of United Cooperatives alone paid a good R100 million to stop the strikes from ending!

As of now, losses already amount to tens of millions of tonnes of rolled metal. This is perhaps comparable only with our losses in the metallurgy industry during the Great Patriotic War.

Having paralyzed the national economy's most important sector, and by so doing effectively brought the country's economy to a halt, the strike's inciters are trying to organize "countrywide support" for their destructive actions as well. Donations for the strikers are collected at clubs and banks, and attempts were made to tie in the Leninist subbotnik [voluntary unpaid labor on day off] with this. Figuratively speaking, they want the people themselves to tighten the noose that has been put around their necks. But VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA calls all of this the "great initiative of the new age." You see that political cynicism has really and truly reached the limit!

The actions of the Russian Federation of Independent Trade Unions' leadership are also contradictory. On the one hand, they put forward completely justified demands, including the abolition of wage limits, the adoption of republic laws on indexation and employment, the abolition of the notorious five percent tax, and a number of others. On the other hand, they put forward demands which they know in advance are unrealizable today, whatever government undertook them. The country simply does not have the resources for it. And in our situation, to incite strikes, that is, to halt production, is only to exacerbate the crisis and further undermine the potential for meeting people's vital needs.

An analysis of the distribution of political forces shows that it is our opponents who have the greatest interest in the development of social conflict. They display a patent reluctance to get down to real work, substituting unscrupulous politicking. Careless of people's futures, they have adopted the tactics "the worse things get, the better," in the interests of their strategy of replacing the state's sociopolitical structure. They are able to pursue these tactics successfully by virtue of the powers they obtained as a result of elections to soviets at various levels.

You need only look at the results of a year's activity by the present Moscow City Soviet. The only problems that can be listed as having been resolved during that period are the renaming of a dozen streets and subway stations, ration coupons for sugar and vodka, and the organization of trade by invitation—which, incidentally, takes millions of people away from their work and gives them the irritation of waiting in lines of thousands of people, without adding one iota to the goods in the stores. And these so-called "gains" by Moscow City Soviet are achieved against the background of wrecked housing construction plans, the failure to hand over 20,000 apartments in the course of this same year, and the halving of the construction of social, cultural, and consumer facilities. The state of the city's medical services is deteriorating disastrously. Here, as in everything, the moneybags takes priority, and the honest working person is the loser. As a kind of barometer of the city's lack of prosperity and a symptom of the gravity of its ills, we have its unprecedented state of neglect and dirtiness.

It is dispiriting that in these conditions the Moscow City Soviet is more worried about resolving political tasks than about the city's problems. Even the Moscow City Soviet building has basically become a headquarters for various parties and associations.

Forces in opposition to the CPSU have recently become increasingly organized.

A course has been set toward creating an all-Union political party with a strict vertical structure and primary cells in the labor collectives, as, and I quote, an "organized opposition to the Gorbachev leadership." Its social base is supposed to consist of repreesentatives of private business, leaseholders, cooperative workers, private farmers, and activists from the republics' national movements. The idea is insistently promulgated, and again I quote, that "...struggling for power in the provinces is futile, what is needed is to seize power in the center." It is clear from this what lies behind the outwardly attractive slogans about holding a "roundtable" and forming a coalition government of "people's confidence."

Our political opponents have no mechanisms to restrain them from adventurism and lack of principle in the power struggle. Like a runaway horse, they gallop madly ahead, prepared to drag the entire state into the abyss after them, with no thought for the victims.

This became particularly clear during the period of preparation for and holding of the referendum and during the recent Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. At one and the same time, for instance, "Democratic Russia" was calling on people to say "no" to the Union because, so they said, of its unclear formulation in the published draft of the Union treaty, but to say "yes" to a president in the republic and a mayor in Moscow, even though there were not even any draft documents about their possible powers.

While fiercely attacking the USSR president, who allegedly seeks personal dictatorial power, they were at the same time demanding emergency powers for the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

And in general, the masks are off. There is no longer any need to try to find out who nurtures dictatorial plans. The revelations of People's Deputy Bocharov in the weekly SOBESEDNIK, headed "Economic Dictatorship," are the clearest possible exposition of the views of his comrades in "democracy." Disband parties, ban debates and all discussion of the actions of executive organs, introduce strict press censorship—in short, no assemblies of more than three people. So these people's true political creed is out in the open.

VII.

Today, the elections of Russia's president and the capital's mayor are at the center of the political struggle.

What is our stance in this connection?

In the Russian presidential elections everything has been turned on its head. The future president's powers are not being discussed, only the mechanism for his election. The actual draft law, it has to be said, is pseudodemocratic. The nomination of candidates and their election campaigns are in fact just soap bubbles, nothing but screens. After all, only a person who wins the support of at least one-third of RSFSR people's deputies will, it is proposed, be able to become a real candidate.

The declared right of labor collectives of enterprises, institutions, and organizations, collectives of educational establishments, and citizens' assemblies to nominate their own candidates is an illusion, as it is conditional on the collection of a million citizens' signatures in support of the candidacy in a fairly short space of time.

Therefore we consider it necessary that the campaign for the RSFSR presidential elections should begin with the definition of his powers and the formulation of a truly democratic procedure for electing him on a nationwide basis. It is time to reject the pernicious practice of creating functions around individuals.

We also approach the proposals about electing a city mayor from the same positions.

Here the basis should be the law on Moscow's status as capital of the USSR and the RSFSR, a draft of which was published the other day.

The draft must be widely discussed in the party organizations, labor collectives, and places of residence so that legislators can take maximum account of the opinion of Muscovites.

Over the coming days, seminars for the broad party aktiv, "roundtables," talks with RSFSR people's deputies and experts, and speeches in the media will be organized.

We must not drag out the work on Moscow's status. Its speedy approval is in all our interests. Then it will be possible to resolve all the questions connected with electing the leader of the city.

VIII.

In the conditions of general crisis which our society is experiencing, we must also analyze constantly the state of affairs within the party and the city party organization.

Party organizations have found themselves facing a barrage of criticism of the CPSU over empty store shelves, economic collapse, and interethnic conflicts, as well as frenzied, provocative attacks on the CPSU by power-hungry politicians.

A mass exodus of Communists from CPSU ranks is under way. In 1990 and in the first quarter of the current year over 200,000 people were expelled from or left the party.

As meetings with Communists show, many organizations were not ready to work in conditions of a fast changing sociopolitical situation, economic instability, the future privatization of enterprises, and the absence of real guarantees of social protection for working people. In this atmosphere, some party organizations see no purpose in their activity, they are losing their bearings, and this reduces their authority and weakens their ranks.

Some of our comrades see our party's way out of the crisis in a new round of intraparty discussions and the convening of an extraordinary congress. It would be rash to rely on this. We can only overcome the crisis if the party organizations concentrate on concrete action. The "Moscow Communists' Action Program," adopted at our last party conference, can and must serve as a guide.

Regarding party strategy, we should undoubtedly get down to active work on the new CPSU Program. As you know, right now our joint group of specialists, with our Leningrad comrades, is working on the recently published draft of this document. We believe the future CPSU Program must comprise two basic parts: a maximum program aimed at the long term future, and a minimum program of concrete measures which the party offers society by way of stabilizing the situation and overcoming the crisis. The maximum program, to the extent that it is ready, could be examined and adopted at the All-Union Party Conference.

IX.

There is one more question which concerns the party—that of the attitude toward the present leadership.

Obviously, everybody is aware of the growing pressure for a change of CPSU leader. This is due to the painful progress of the transformations, the burden of mistakes in perestroyka, life's increasing difficulties, and the policy of balancing the various political forces, which is incomprehensible to many but with which M.S. Gorbachev personally is associated.

Indecision undermines Gorbachev's authority and at the same time that of the party. People expect vigorous and consistent activity in all spheres of life, especially in securing the legal and socioeconomic protection of the individual.

But to willingly oust the head of state from leadership of the CPSU would be illogical from the point of view of political common sense for society's ruling party, which has the majority of seats in the Union legislature and the Cabinet of Ministers.

In response to manifestations of the people's energy, which demands action, the party in its turn is obliged to make demands on the Central Committee general secretary and USSR president, and help him to overcome the vagueness of his policies, adopt a realistic anticrisis program, and ensure that it is implemented in practice. Only thus can we regain the Communists' trust and the people's support.

Such, comrades, are the basic problems of the present moment which the gorkom plenum has gathered to discuss.

Moscow Gorkom's Prokofyev Interviewed

PM0405143991 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 91 p 2

[Interview with Yu. Prokofyev, first secretary of Moscow CPSU City Committee, by correspondent V. Yevseyev; date, place not given: "Yuriy Prokofyev: 'A Spontaneous Way Out of the Crisis Cannot Be Relied Upon'"]

[Text] **What Is the "Party" Coloration of Criticism?**

[Yevseyev] Yuriy Anatolyevich, the recent April days have been very stormy and tense for the CPSU. Party committee plenums in a number of parts of the country and the joint plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission attracted universal attention not least because an unusually harsh assessment of the party leadership's activity was made there.

"Communists no longer accept the chronic belatedness of actions or the vagueness and ambiguity of the positions of the CPSU Central Committee, the Politburo, and the general secretary." These are lines from the Moscow gorkom [city party committee] plenum statement. It contains a demand for a detailed examination of the government's anticrisis program, which the plenum described as declarative, not containing a mechanism for realizing anticrisis measures, and not convincing people of the need for them or of their adequacy.

This document had been adopted the day before and was published in our newspaper on the day the joint Central Committee and Central Control Commission plenum opened. I am talking with you after it has completed its work. Are you satisfied with its course and results, and did the plenum fulfill the demands of Moscow's Communists?

[Prokofyev] The tough wording of party documents, particularly the statement adopted by our gorkom plenum, is accounted for by the situation which has taken shape in the country—many enterprises are virtually on the verge of stopping work, and the reform of price formation has led to a sharp deterioration in people's living standards. All this could not fail to give rise to harsh assessments.

However, I wish to point out that at the city plenum we not only criticized the government program but also made suggestions for getting the country out of the crisis. The 12 points, which can be called a program-minimum, are specific measures making it possible to proceed to new forms of management without considerable detriment to working people's interests. We forwarded these suggestions to the editorial commission of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission plenum.

I will at once say that eight of our 12 points were essentially included in the resolution adopted by the plenum "On the Situation in the Country and Ways to Get the Economy Out of the Crisis." So from this viewpoint we have reason to be satisfied with the results of the plenum. And Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov's report there differed significantly from the program which was submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet session for discussion and which provoked a very critical attitude toward itself when discussed in a whole number of party organizations. When addressing the plenum V.S. Pavlov made corresponding amendments.

[Yevseyev] But maybe this was not a result of reflection on the part of Pavlov, the country's prime minister, but a concession on the part of Pavlov, member of the CPSU Central Committee?

[Prokofyev] I would not contrast these two posts held by one man. He answers for one and the same thing both as prime minister and as a member of the Central Committee. The party has not absolved and does not absolve itself of responsibility for the state of affairs in society. Moreover, it was not an internal party question that was discussed at the plenum but ways to get the country's entire economy out of the crisis. I will point out, incidentally, that I consider it a correct decision by the plenum participants to concentrate on just this question, deferring a detailed discussion of another one—the work of Communists in soviets of people's deputies.

Regarding some kind of specicial "party" coloration to the criticisms and suggestions being made in connection with the discussion of the anticrisis program proposed by the government, I will cite just one example. The Moscow CPSU Gorkom plenum and the session of the leaders of nine republics jointly with the country's president were working on the same day and in parallel, but a whole number of anticrisis measures elaborated in both places are essentially identical. In this connection I will repeat again and again: This is not the time for political ambitions and party games, and it is now necessary to save the country. A spontaneous way out of the crisis cannot be relied upon.

Why Did the Plenum Not Accept the General Secretary's Resignation?

[Yevseyev] From the official information report on the plenum it appears that "during the discussions M.S. Gorbachev raised the issue of his resignation from the post of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in connection with individual speeches made by participants in the plenum." Yuriy Anatolyevich, could you tell us in more detail about this moment in the plenum's work? What "individual speeches" are referred to?

[Prokofyev] On the eve of the plenum demands for the resignation of the general secretary of the Central Committee were being made quite frequently. They resulted from the complex and quite contradictory situation prevailing in society and the party. They were not the intrigues of the party apparatus by any means, as some people are trying to present them, but the mood of fairly broad party masses. There was a heated and sharp discussion of this question at our city plenum, too. I spoke about all this openly in my speech at the Central Committee plenum. There I appealed to Mikhail Sergeyevich to understand that people are waiting not so much for resolute statements as energetic and consistent actions in all spheres of life, and that that is the only way of restoring the Communists' trust and the people's support.

Practically all of the speakers at the plenum spoke equally openly and sharply. But obviously the criticism was not only directed at M.S. Gorbachev, but also the Central Committee as a whole, the Politburo, and the Central Committee secretariat. It concerned lack of coordination, delays in work, insufficient information given to Communists on whose behalf—but often without whose knowledge—fundamental decisions are often taken, and the insufficient influence of the party on the development of the socioeconomic situation in the country.

What "individual speeches" are being referred to? As I have already said, critical observations were made in practically every speech. But they were perhaps expressed more harshly and emotionally by V.P. Sapachev, an electric locomotive driver from Irkutsk, and A.M. Zaytsev, first secretary of the Kemerovo Party

Obkom [Party Committee]. In any case, soon after their speeches, Mikhail Sergeyevich took the floor and said that if the Central Committee believes that it all rests on Gorbachev personally and that he is the one who lost the trust of the party masses, then he would raise the issue of his resignation. An interval was announced so that the Politburo could discuss the situation that had taken shape.

[Yevseyev] Did you examine this question in the presence of M.S. Gorbachev himself?

[Prokofyev] Of course.

[Yevseyev] Did he insist on resigning at the Politburo sitting, too?

[Prokofyev] Having raised this question he naturally stuck to his guns.

[Yevseyev] That means that they persuaded him to stay?

[Prokofyev] Why say persuade? There is such a concept as party discipline. The information report published in the press gave the precise wording: "In view of the supreme interests of the country, the people, and the party, an examination of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's proposal that he resign from the post of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee was dropped." The plenum upheld that.

[Yevseyev] Was there a vote?

[Prokofyev] Yes, the overwhelming majority voted for the Politburo's proposal, 13 voted against, and 14 abstained.

[Yevseyev] One of the reasons for the criticism of Gorbachev by party organizations was that he has paid insufficient attention to the party. But now the man has asked to resign but has been left in his existing post as a matter of party discipline, will he not have less opportunity and desire to work on purely party matters?

[Prokofyev] I disagree. There was more criticism of Gorbachev as president of the country. Of course, it is hard to separate the president from the general secretary when they are one and the same person. Thus the mistakes which the country's leadership has made are automatically applied to the party.

In that sense the situation that has developed is quite bizarre. For example, the Moscow City Soviet tripled the cost of transport in the city and the people blame the Communists. Prices are being raised. It isn't Communist workers, Communist kolkhoz [collective farm] members, or Communist employees who adopted this decision, it was adopted by the Supreme Soviet, the Cabinet of Ministers.... But Communists are in the majority in the Supreme Soviet and the Cabinet of Ministers—so the party is responsible for the rise in prices.

I repeat that the party does not deny its responsibility for the situation in society or the policy being pursued in the country. But since the party does bear this responsibility the main provisions of state policy must be worked out together with the party, it must be consulted. Especially since the president of the country is the general secretary of that party. That is why Communists criticized Mikhail Sergeyevich, for being remote from the party masses when adopting important decisions which seem to emanate from the party. And not for not working enough on internal party problems. We have people to draft instructions on questions of party accounts, subscriptions, and so forth.

Perhaps the most important demand which plenum participants raised was ensuring the fulfillment of those decisions which are adopted. And greater effectiveness in stabilizing the situation in the country.

[Yevseyev] Can the party help in this?

[Prokofyev] Yes, if it really gets involved in elaborating these decisions rather than merely paying lip-service to that.

[Yevseyev] On the eve of the plenum Gorbachev's possible resignation was subjected to extensive discussion. Cleaving to various political positions and with varying attitudes toward Mikhail Sergeyevich himself, many people voiced the opinion that at this moment removing him from the post of general secretary would play into conservative forces' hands....

[Prokofyev] I personally regard these statements with great suspicion. I think that this is more like a change of tactics than real understanding of the political situation. Yesterday there were shouts of "Down with Gorbachev!" today these people supposedly support him. Are you sure that the speakers will not return tomorrow to the slogans they used yesterday? There is criticism in the name of construction and criticism in the name of destruction. Both extreme left-wingers and extreme right-wingers are with increasing frequency finding a common language—at any rate they are closing ranks—in the latter.

It is not only a question of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The figure of the USSR president and general secretary of the ruling party is always going to focus everything—both the attitude to the party and the attitude to state power. Anyone in Gorbachev's place now would to a greater or lesser extent come in for his fair share of criticism. Perhaps, in the very initial stages, there would be somewhat less criticism of the "new man," so to speak....

[Yevseyev] Wouldn't he enjoy the people's trust for a while?

[Prokofyev] Yes, but it would be short-lived. Because it is simply impossible to extricate the country from this kind of crisis in a short time. Whatever political actions are undertaken, the—any!—ruling party and its leaders will constantly be criticized. The further you go, the more criticism there is. As long as the situation in the country fails to improve.

Let's look at the new political movements' position. They, too, are being criticized in areas where they have become the leaders. Of course, the Communist Party comes in for more criticism. But it has far more history and incomparable responsibility—for both old and new mistakes—behind it. The fact that the party is changing is hard and sometimes painful, but it is finding itself in a new situation—only a blind man could fail to notice that.

So, at the latest plenum we were not so much criticizing Gorbachev as the party leadership's incorrect style of work. We were criticizing it in order to change it, in order to ensure that the millions-strong party begins to operate on full revs. But criticism from extreme left-wing and extreme right-wing positions is designed to isolate Communists and exclude the party from public life. That is the fundamental difference. Yet slogans and appeals may sometimes even correspond word for word.

Will the "Ten" Remain "Ten"

[Yevseyev] The statement by the "Ten" is today being described as the "Joint Statement on Urgent Steps To Stabilize the Situation in the Country and Overcome the Crisis." In addition to the USSR president's signature, it bears the signatures of nine leaders of nine republics. What does this represent, in your view, Yuriy Anatolyevich: the prototype of the future Union—nine republics and the center?

[Prokofyev] That may well be. The statement was signed by nine republic leaders who recognized the results of the all-Union referendum.

I am profoundly convinced that now that a new economic space has formed from these nine republics and it has been given to understand at the same time that the other republics have no intention of joining them, new conditions may develop that may themselves change this quantitative ratio.

[Yevseyev] Do you mean that economic circumstances could prompt the leaders of other republics to change their decision?

[Prokofyev] I think that the faster the Union treaty is signed by these nine republics, the faster other republics will want to accede to it. Because when they sign the treaty they will immediately be placed in different economic conditions.

A similar process is currently taking place in the East European countries, former socialist countries, some of which, while having been in a hurry to declare a break with us, are once again proposing the reestablishment of partnership relations, since the United States, on whom they had pinned great hopes, is in no great hurry to establish them, and if it does establish them, it is on terms it is accustomed to operating on. I am convinced it is naive to rely on assistance from a "rich uncle." We can only extricate ourselves from the situation we have gotten into through joint efforts, by supporting one another.

[Yevseyev] This statement is again jointly signed by Gorbachev and Yeltsin—two names which now, perhaps, symbolize irreconcilability and mutual revulsion. At the same time, everyone so wants them to get together. So what are we talking about, in your view, Yuriy Anatolyevich—reconciliation, compromise, necessity?

[Prokofyev] What is set out in the statement is the minimum that is necessary in order to get out of the crisis, to make it possible to embark on stabilizing the situation in the country. It would be folly not to sign this minimum. It would mean opposing the Union. I believe that Boris Nikiolayevioch Yeltsin, who is currently preparing for the presidential elections in the republic, absolutely must have considered this.

Whose Capital Will Moscow Be?

[Yevseyev] The press has recently poublished two docuemnts that concern Muscovites: a USSR draft law on the status of the capital of the USSR and RSFSR and an RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolution on the status and structure of organs of government in the city of Moscow— capital of the RSFSR. What do you consider is the difference between the Union and Russian approaches to our city's status?

[Prokofyev] Above all the fact that the Russian approach declares Moscow the capital of the RSFSR alone, while the law prepared by the USSR Supreme Soviet commission treats Moscow as the capital of the USSR and of the RSFSR. There is a delimitation of the functions of Union, republic, and local organs of power on the territory of Moscow. There is no such delimitation in the republic document.

Second, it seems to me quite wrong to even adopt the Russian document after the publication of the draft law, which, by presidential decree, has to be agreed with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and, essentially, jointly adopted. It is a political step more than anything, particularly as in many respects the two documents—Union and republic—are similar.

A confusing aspect of the Russian provision is the haste with which a date is set for the election of the mayor of Moscow, even though there is no provision at all for such a position at the moment under the existing Constitution.

I advocate strengthening executive authority in the city in every possible way but I do not think that it would be right for the mayor of Moscow to combine both executive and legislative authority. That after all is precisely what we sought to avoid when implementing the reform on separating powers. I am afraid that this "innovation" may effectively devalue the Soviets. There is also the fear that this may trigger similar processes in the country as a whole. Everyone knows well from the past the result of combining legislative and executive powers in one person. Thus I believe that it is necessary to think properly before electing a mayor.

[Yevseyev] Nevertheless, the date of the election of the mayor of Moscow has been fixed for 12 June next. If it remains in force what will the city party organization's position be on this question?

[Prokofyev] The elections of the mayor should be preceded by the adoption of the Law on the Status of Moscow. It is well known that the Moscow CPSU Gorkom has a number of times asked the USSR Supreme Soviet commission and asked the Supreme Soviet leadership and the president directly to accelerate the elaboration and adoption of this law because the lack of such a law is holding back our city's development. Now the draft Law has been published and comments and suggestions on it are being collated. Nevertheless, the date of the mayor's election, like the date of the Russian presidential elections, namely 12 June, is in my view hasty.

At the end of May there will be a meeting of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, which is due to adopt the Law on the President and submit amendments to the Constitution in connection with the election of the president and the election of the mayor of Moscow. But those elections are going to take place on 12 June. People simply will not have time to prepare properly for them. I think it would be better to postpone the elections until fall when the Union treaty will have been finalized and, I hope, signed. Then the mutual relations between the republics and the role of the republics' leaders and the Union leaders will be clear. Furthermore, before the Russian presidential elections take place the question of the federation itself—which part of itself it will represent—should be resolved. And that is no easy question. The process which is determined by the republics' striving for greater autonomy is typical not just of the Union as a whole but of the RSFSR, too. Many autonomous units in Russia are putting forward their own terms. Some Russian republics are already raising the question of a president of their own. In my view, all these things should be sorted out before the election of the RSFSR president.

But let us return to the mayor of Moscow. If people's deputies adopt a decision to elect one the capital's Communists will not, of course, remain aloof. We hope to nominate our own candidates to this post.

[Yevseyev] Why such cautious wording—"we hope?"

[Prokofyev] Because the draft provisions on the election of the mayor that exist today are not so democratic as to permit labor collectives and all Muscovites to nominate their own candidates for this post. At the moment this right is enjoyed only by Moscow city soviet deputies. But I hope that just as the RSFSR Supreme Soviet amended the Law on the Election of the President, so the provision on the election of the mayor will be amended and Muscovites will be enabled to participate in nominating candidates.

[Yevseyev] If it is not a secret, who will the Moscow CPSU Gorkom nominate in that case?

[Prokofyev] Let us not be so hasty. There is still no law at the moment and the election procedure has not been drawn up. But we have worthy candidates.

[Yevseyev] But what will Moscow Communists' position be in the elections of the president of Russia?

[Prokofyev] We will support the one who offers the most realistic and correct action program regardless of personal or party allegiance.

On What Is It Possible To Agree Today?

[Yevseyev] Proposals on the need for representatives of various political forces to sit at a "roundtable" are now cropping up increasingly frequently. Is this realistic in your opinion, Yuriy Anatolyevich? Do you believe in the possibility of reaching agreement? Has this possibility not been missed already?

[Prokofyev] Our situation now is different to that in East European countries, where such "roundtables" have been held. There they met under conditions of a virtual single-party system, before free democratic elections were held. And this was necessary in order to assess the distribution of forces. We have already held such elections, and political parties and legislative factions have been formed. And we now have the opportunity to conduct any political dialogue within the framework of legislative activity—which, in fact, is what happens at sessions and congresses of our soviets. Is there a need for other forms? For "roundtables" are not held by Laborites and Conservatives in Britain or by Republicans and Democrats in the United States.

On the other hand I realize, of course, that many proposals to hold a "roundtable" do not so much pursue the creation of some new political institution or the organization of yet another measure as convey hope in the possibility of consolidation and unity. Looked at this way, the recent meeting of the leaders of nine republics may also be considered a "roundtable."

Regarding the various political forces, I honestly believe that we have just two serious political forces—the CPSU, which favors preserving the socialist nature of society, and the "Democratic Russia" movement, which favors the capitalization of our society. All the rest are trends which attach themselves to them.

On what can these two polar forces agree between themselves? On just one thing—civil concord and the nonuse of strong-arm methods in the political struggle. Naturally, there can be no ideological reconciliation between them.

[Yevseyev] Civil concord and the nonuse of force—that is not so little. I think all sober-minded people dream of this with hope.

[Prokofyev] I fully share these hopes. I have always advocated and will advocate the need for civil concord and civilized methods of waging political struggle. But we do not need to seek new methods for this. It is quite sufficient to use constitutional, legislative possibilities.

[Yevseyev] The final question, Yuriy Anatolyevich. Our conversation will be published on the eve of 1 May. How do you intend to spend that day?

[Prokofyev] I will go to the May Day demonstration to be held in Red Square on the initiative of the Moscow Trade Union Federation. The Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum appealed to the Communists and all the working people of Moscow to support this initiative of the Moscow Trade Union Federation and to participate in the demonstration in the ranks of their labor collectives.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA's readers and all Muscovites on this traditional working people's festival and to wish them continued strength of spirit and cohesion even during our difficult days in the name of ensuring a worthy life.

Effects of RSFSR-Lithuania Treaty Viewed

91UN1365D Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 19 Apr 91 p 2

[Article by TASS correspondents N. Kupriy and V. Bondarenko: "Legislative Secrets: Fork It Over, Russia!"]

[Text] Moscow—The treaty whose draft is still being discussed in the ministries of the republic government will cost Russia hundreds of millions or, rather, billions of rubles [R]. According to its provisions, all expenditures related to driving the Russian-speaking population out of Lithuania will come from the budget... of Russia itself.

Until quite recently the very idea of the document we learned about in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] House of Soviets was resolutely rejected by the highest Russian leadership. In January of this year, republic Supreme Soviet member Sergey Baburin, speaking at a session of the Russian legislature, asked the question: Are any negotiations being conducted on the conditions for the resettlement of the Russian-speaking population from the Baltic republics? The answer was firm: Such a document did not exist. And here is this "nonexistent" document before us—the draft of the agreement between the Government of Lithuania and the Government of the RSFSR concerning migration of the population.

Judging from the date on its last page, it was prepared on 25 February. But from the accompanying note from the Russian Ministry of Labor one can see that it was decided to begin negotiations on "organized resettlement," as the deportation of Russians from Lithuania is diplomatically called here, as early as last year.

"Fortunately, this is just a draft. But it is a terrible draft, for its goals and tasks by no means serve to resolve the crucial problems of the natural migration of people of various nationalities, and in spite of all its external 'niceties,' it discriminates against the Russian-speaking population and does not envision protection of their rights and interests," says RSFSR People's Deputy S. Baburin.

"One is struck first by the fact that it is a fairly thoroughly prepared document—a treaty between the governments of the two republics. I emphasize that is has been developed in great detail, externally from objective positions, but actually from positions that are anti-Russian and degrading to Russians. For example, the fifth article of the draft says that the parties agree that the receiving side will fund expenditures for resettlement. That is, the Russian Government is discussing with the Lithuanian Government the real possibility of resettling its compatriots from the places where many of them were born, and it was certainly not on their own that they were suddenly struck by a willingness to move, at the expense of... the Russians.

In order to imagine the "price" of this projected treaty, consider this information: According to the calculations of specialists, settling one working person in a new locality today costs R60,000 or more. This problem was worked out beforehand with respect to Lithuania. According to current data, about 150,000 of the 350,000 families of Russian-speaking citizens living on the territory of Lithuania intend to leave. At the same time it is planned to begin resettlement of families from Latvia and Estonia.

In the sixth article of the treaty the parties commit themselves (this is still a draft, of course) to creating living conditions for the newcomers that are just as good as what they had in their previous place of residence. In today's conditions is it not a mockery of common sense for such commitments to be made by the Russian republic, where the situation with housing is as bad as it can possibly be at each geographical point. With the crisis in Russia today, how can it provide living conditions that are "no worse" for people moving from a republic where the standard of living has always been one order of magnitude higher?

And the further you go, the worse it gets. How little respect they must have for the people—Russian or Lithuanian—to even be discussing conditions whereby the resettled families are given only a five-year period of social guarantees—until 31 December 1995. Or conditions whereby "the parties agree that they will take a permanent place of residence only for those individuals and family members who abandon all of their dwelling space in the other state and submit documents confirming that they have relinquished the dwelling space they had."

"But anyway, Sergey Nikolayevich, this is still only a draft," we note in a conversation with the people's deputy.

"Of course, one might object that these are proposals and only proposals from the Lithuanian side. But what is remarkable is that the Russian leadership, which in words is so concerned about the needs of the Russians, has entered negotiations involving such proposals."

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Situation 'Getting More Tense' in Moldova

LD0305150191 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 3 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Fedor Angeliy]

[Text] Kishinev May 3 TASS—With the approaching of the opening day of a regular session of the Moldavian [Moldovan] parliament (May 14), deputies' clubs are getting more active and, unfortunately, the public and political situation in the republic is getting more tense. The 108 people's deputies representing the agricultural sector are the most influential group in parliament.

They intend to demand on the opening day that the Moldavian president make a report about the economic, social and political situation of the republic and ways of overcoming the crisis it is facing. They also wish to discuss the blueprint of the law about the Moldavian Government, proposals on its structure and candidates to ministerial posts, the reorganisation of the presidium of the Moldavian parliament and a report of the delegations, assigned by a parliamentary session to work out a general version of the treaty on the union of sovereign states. The leaders of the Moldavian parliament ignored the resolution of the session and did not send a delegation to Moscow.

The people's deputies representing the agricultural sector are continually subjected to pressure and blackmail on the part of the right wing of the Moldavian Popular Front. The Mircea Druk government, abusing its power, is going out of its way to clamp down on the independently-minded legislators, most of whom are heads of collective and state farms. This is why it sends one inspection group after another to the farms, the directors of which have an opinion of their own, different from that of the Moldavian leaders, specifically, on the problem of signing the Union treaty.

Moldova Party Secretaries View National Situation

LD0505053191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1314 GMT 4 May 91

[By TASS correspondent F. Angeli]

[Text] Kishinev, 4 May (TASS)—A meeting of secretaries of the primary Party organizatons of Moldova has supported the joint declaration of the USSR president and the leaders of nine Union republics on urgent measures to stabilize the situation in the country and overcome the crisis. The meeting took place in the republic's capital yesterday. A report was delivered by Grigoriy Yeremey, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Communist Party of Moldova Central Committee.

He concentrated on the results of the combined plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission and the tasks of the primary party organizations of the republic. It was noted at the meeting that the development of the situation in the country is becoming extremly dangerous. The standard of living of the population is falling drastically. People are uncertain of the future. Reactionary forces are banking mainly on anticommunism, and using nonparliamentary methods of struggle.

Moldova, Estonia Sign Economic Accord

LD0305134191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1300 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] Arbitration bodies of Moldova and Estonia have signed an agreement on direct cooperation. In accordance with this document, the arbitration bodies in the two republics assume responsibility for observing the protection of the lawful interest of economic subjects situationed on the territory of both Moldova and Estonina in the event of economic sanctions being applied against them.

Moldovan Official on Soviet Army Call-up

LD0405151591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1015 GMT 4 May 91

[By MOLDOVA-PRES correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev, 4 May—"In the territory of Moldova, call-up into the ranks of the Soviet Army is conducted only in accordance with the laws of the republic." The MOLDOVA-PRES news agency correspondents were told this by Colonel Nikolae Kirtoake, general director of Moldova's state department for military matters.

This means that the republic's citizens are not called up into the ranks of the Soviet Army without an application from the conscript and the written consent of his parents. Moreover, according to an understanding between the commission of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet on military matters and state security and the republican military commissariat the conscripts must perform their service only on the territory of the republic. Those wishing to serve in the Soviet Army beyond Moldova's borders ought also to submit written applications. Those refusing to perform their service should be certified by a medical commission and be registered with the local authorities; however, they cannot be called to account because the relevant legislative act does not have legal force on Moldova's territory.

The general director of the state department for military matters stressed that the law "on alternative military service" could remove many problems. Its draft has already been prepared and it has been submitted for the agenda of the session of the Moldova SSR Supreme Soviet that opens in mid-May. It is assumed that the legislators will adopt this legislative act, and that it will come into force from the time of its adoption.

Moldovan CP Issues Economic Forecast

LD0305173191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1015 GMT 3 May 91

[By TASS correspondent]

[Text] Kishinev, 3 May (TASS)—If the trends in the Moldovan economy continue, then in a month or two enterprises in the republic will begin to close down and the number of people out of work will increase. This is the forecast for the development of the situation by the socioeconomic commission of the Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee. The results of the analysis were issued by the MOLDOVA-PRES Agency.

The analysis points out that the republic's economy is approaching a deadlock. While the volumes of production of industrial goods and foodstuffs are falling sharply, the profits of enterprises continue to grow. In the first two months of the current year they amounted to 369 million rubles, which is 37.7 percent above the same period last year.

The greater part of the economic difficulties has been brought about by a breakdown in relations that has been going on for years. Up until today, for example, treaties for the delivery to Moldova of combustible materials and lubricants has been concluded by 50-60 percent. The situation with our raw materials imported into the republic is no better.

This situation has hit market consumers hard. The shortage of gasoline, coal, timber, and other raw materials has to be covered, first and foremost, by reducing their market assets.

Caucasus

Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan's Activities Reported

Views Meeting With Gorbachev

LD0405155991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1349 GMT 4 May 91

[(Marina Lelyavali) report on news conference by Armenian Supreme Soviet Chairman Leon Ter-Petrosyan with unidentified reporters in Moscow on 4 May]

[Text] [(Lelyavali)] The news conference is still continuing. The Armenian Supreme Soviet chairman is talking about events and answering questions from correspondents.

Opening this meeting, Leon Ter-Petrosyan reported the following details. A monstrous crime has been committed against the Armenian people, but this time there is something specific about it: The crime was committed not by Azerbaijani bandits but by the Soviet Army, particularly by the internal troops. This danger was seen long ago, the appropriate steps were taken, and the country's leadership was alerted to the impending danger.

It was said that the status quo created must not be violated in any way and that any violation of it would have disastrous consequences. As usual, however, Moscow proved to be extraordinarily slow—if, of course, this monstrous action was not conceived there. I have grounds to believe, Leon Ter-Petrosyan said, that this was a deal between Mutalibov and, in the first place, the Union Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Internal troops command. A great share of the blame for this crime belongs to Pugo and the commander of the internal troops, General Shatalin. They submitted the hypothesis according to which there is no peaceful Armenian population in these villages, but only Armenian fighters who must be cleared from the villages.

Leon Ter-Petrosyan accordingly sent telegrams to President Gorbachev and other influential politicians, but he received no reply. Probably, in the opinion of Mr. Ter-Petrosyan, the appropriate circles in Moscow, together with Mutalibov, decided to fully implement their program: to force the Armenian population to abandon two villages in Khanlarskiy Rayon, the villages of Getashen and Matunashen.

Ter-Petrosyan had a 90-minute talk yesterday with the country's president, Mikhail Gorbachev. In the opinion of Ter-Petrosyan, the deportation of the inhabitants from these Armenian villages is a new stage of escalating and creates insoluble problems for Mutalibov himself. Gorbachev sees the root of the evil in the presence of Armenian fighters in the villages.

The Armenian Supreme Soviet chairman is convinced that he was nevertheless able to convince Gorbachev to fulfill a number of conditions, namely: The USSR president will take all necessary measures to ensure the safety of the native population of the villages of Getashen and Matunashen and guarantee that this population cannot be deported under any circumstances; the unhindered landing of helicopters delivering foodstuffs, medicines, and specialists for giving humane help must be ensured; it is necessary to extend the authority of the commander of the special Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast region to the settlements of Getashen and Matunashen, with their later inclusion in Shaumyanovskiy Rayon, Azerbaijan.

If there is precise and rigorous observation of these conditions, the Armenian side will make the maximum efforts and use all means at its disposal to halt the military confrontation. Gorbachev, of course, promised to take the situation under the capital's control.

What are the realities of the situation today? According to information at 1100, the situation remains extremely tense [words indistinct] a rumor is circulating concerning preparations to storm the villages. Intense shooting is still continuing in the northern border areas of Armenia.

Replies to Gorbachev Draft Protocol

NC0605063891 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 5 May 91

["Letter Levon Ter-Petrosyan sent to USSR President Gorbachev"—radio headline]

[Text] Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich: In replying to the draft protocol you proposed after our meeting, I hereby state that I believe that the current dispute can be resolved if the conditions mentioned below are abided by:

1. The USSR president, acting in accordance with the USSR Constitution, shall take all necessary measures to ensure the security of the native population of Getashen (Chaykend) and Martunashen villages in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. He will also guarantee that the population of those villages will not be deported regardless of the circumstances.

2. He shall ensure that helicopters bringing foodstuffs, medicine, and specialists to provide medical care to the villages will be allowed to land unhindered.

3. Getashen and Martunashen settlements shall be incorporated into Shaumyanovskiy Rayon of Azerbaijan SSR and the jurisdiction of the military commandant of the state of emergency in Nagorno-Karabakh should be extended over the villages as well.

4. In the event of the clear and unreserved implementation of these points, the Armenian side will exert every effort and utilize all means available to it to terminate the armed resistance.

I am aware of the complexity of the current situation; however, I think that if all the sides show goodwill the proposed conditions will solve the existing dispute.

I have been very puzzled by the fact that in the draft protocol you proposed Martunashen is virtually unmentioned. Should we then conclude that Martunashen village in Khanlarskiy Rayon of Azerbaijan SSR no longer exists? [Signed] Respectfully, Levon Ter-Petrosyan.

Gives Briefing on Gorbachev Meeting

LD0505194591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1904 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Yerevan, 5 May (TASS)—At a routine session of the republic's provisional emergency council Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, described the results of his 90-minute conversation in Moscow with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev during which the situation surrounding the Armenian villages of Getashen (Chaykend) and Martunashen in Azerbaijan was examined. According to Levon Ter-Petrosyan he had "managed to show the president that any contituation of actions involving the use of force in these villages and other rayons with Armenian population may have very serious political consequences".

According to a republican television report, at the end of the meeting Mikhail Gorbachev gave his interlocutor a draft protocol containing proposals for stabilizing the situation in the region. In replying to this the head of the Armenian legislature gave the president a note containing several conditions for safeguarding security and normal life for the population of the village of Getashen and Martunashen.

Levon Ter-Petrosyan told those taking part in the session of his telephone conversation with Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, which also centered on the situation in Getashen. According to the press center of the Armenian legislature, Boris Yeltsin assured him that he "would follow the development of events attentively" and as an initial practical step a group of RSFSR people's deputies led by Fedor Shilov-Kovedyayev would be sent to Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Calm Attributed to Talks

LD0505173191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 5 May 91

[Report by correspondent Karen Khumaryan from Yerevan]

[Text] Last night and the first half of today were relatively quiet in Getashen and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, as well as on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan, except for military helicopters flying over virtually all rayons of Armenia near the border. The Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry considers this relative calm a result of recent meetings and conversations between Ter-Petrosayan, Republic of Armenia Supreme Soviet chairman, with USSR President Gorbachev and other leaders of the country.

Interviewed on Crisis

LD0405230591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 4 May 91

[Interview with Leon Akopovich Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium, by correspondent Irena Troyanovskaya, in Moscow on 4 May—recorded]

[Text] [Troyanovskaya] Leon Akopovich, what measures do you want to undertake to resolve this conflict?

[Ter-Petrosyan] There are two moments here: the local conflict—which has happened in Getashen, and the global one—that concerns the Karabakh problem. Only the local conflict should be tackled now. What has happened in Getashen is another tragedy for the Armenians, another monstrous crime against the Armenian people. This can be put on one level with Sumgait and Baku with a distinct difference: if a mob carried out the pogroms in those cities here the same kind of pogroms that were carried out by the subunits of the Soviet Army of the Internal Troops of the Azerbaijan [words indistinct].

In this case the army has been brought into this very dirty game which I consider impossible to accept and the Russian people should raise a decisive voice and say that such an immoral step is inadmissible, because such a dangerous and horrible precedent could happen again anywhere, even in Moscow. If such a thing happens again this wave could spread to other republics, including Russia.

[Troyanovskaya] Would you like to reach some agreements with Gorbachev?

[Ter-Petrosyan] A dialogue is always possible. In spite of the fact that he is not very much in control of the situation at the present moment—all his policy is based on either disinformation or on a deliberate distortion of recommendations, which is most dangerous—I hope that with the creation of the Security Council he has reliable company that can give reasonable recommendations.

Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Meets on Situation

NC0605094891 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] The Azerbaijan Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium met on 5 May. El'mira Kafarova opened the meeting and analyzed the tense situation which has been created in our republic due to the Nagorno-Karabakh [NKAO] problem. She described President Ayaz Mutalibov's statement and interview with an AZERINFORM correspondent as a step toward the establishment of stability.

The speakers at the meeting described the Armenian Supreme Soviet's appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet to convoke an extraordinary meeting of the USSR deputies as a serious interference in Azerbaijan's internal affairs, as a decision not in accordance with the Constitution, and as an attempt to further worsen the situation in the region and attack the state organs. The Azerbaijan Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a position on the matter.

The position said that the Armenian Supreme Soviet's decision to seek an extraordinary congress of the USSR people's deputies must be regarded as a serious interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Azerbaijan, which is a sovereign state. In addition, the appeal made to the USSR Supreme Soviet to debate the NKAO problem and every attempt to have the extratordinary congress of the USSR deputies convene must be resolutely opposed. In light of Article 81 of the USSR Constitution, the USSR president and the USSR Supreme Soviet must be asked to take resolute measures to obstruct all the aggressive attempts made by Armenia against the Azerbaijan Republic, disband the illegal armed groups in Armenia, and abrogate the anticonstitutional decisions adopted by the Armenian Supreme Soviet for the unification of the NKAO with Armenia.

The text of the decision will be published in the press.

Protests Armenian Supreme Soviet Moves

LD0505182691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1734 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Baku, 5 May (AZERINFORM-TASS)—The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Azerbaijan considers the decision by the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Armenia "On Raising the Issue of Convening an Extraordinary Session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies" in order to discuss at it the issue of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO) and other Armenian population points in Azerbaijan to be crude interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, the Republic of Azerbaijan, says a statement by the Presidium of Azerbaijan's legislature which has been published here. It has expressed a resolute protest against any attempts to make the USSR Supreme Soviet examine again the issue of the NKAO in the Republic of Azerbaijan and to convene an extraordinary session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies over this issue. Furthermore, guided by Article 81 of the USSR Constitution, the Presidium of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet has demanded that the USSR president and the USSR Supreme Soviet "adopt resolute measures to end aggression by the Republic of Armenia against the Republic of Azerbaijan, to disband illegal armed groups which have been created in Armenia, and revoke the anti-constitutional decision by the Armenian Supreme Soviet uniting the NKAO with Armenia."

The war which has been forced upon the Azerbaijani people has already been going on for three years solely on the territory of Azerbaijan, continues the document, with illegally created groups of armed bandits attacking border villages in Azerbaijan, killing peaceful people, soldiers, and officers of the internal troops of the USSR

Ministry of Internal Affairs as well as officers of the law enforcement bodies, says the document. It stresses that the "so-called problem of Nagorno-Karabakh will be resolved on the basis of the Constitution of the Republic of Azerbaijan."

Nagorno-Karabakh Situation Seen as 'Real War'

LD0405161191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 4 May 91

[Text] You already know that a real war is effectively going on in Nagorno-Karabakh. Military actions are taking place with tanks and armored personnel carriers. Here is the latest information that we have received from the USSR Interior Ministry press center:

During 2 and 3 May, settlements in Kazakhskiy, Tauzskiy, and Kubatlinskiy Rayons came under fire from rockets fired by automatic weapons from Noyemberyanskiy, Shamshadinskiy, Idzhevanskiyi, Kafanskiy, and Gorisskiy Rayons in Armenia. As a result, two people died and three were injured, including two militiamen. Militia vehicles were burned out, and there was some damage.

There is an acute shortage of drinking water in Stepanakert. No goods trains have arrived at the station since 27 April. As before, road transportation is possible only within the oblast.

In Mardakertskiy Rayon five missiles were launched at the village of Umudlu, where Azerbaijanis live. In Martuninskiy Rayon the villages of Avdur and Armurishen were fired upon from automatic weapons. Armenians live there. Fortunately, no one was hurt.

In Idzhevasnkiy Rayon a subunit of internal troops was en route from the village of Voskepar in Noyemberyanskiy Rayon, their permanent garrison in Yerevan. The movement of the column was blocked by several inhabitants and fighters. They expressed indignation at the withdrawal of military personnel from areas bordering Azerbaijan and demanded that they be given military equipment.

You know, the most interesting thing, according to the statement by the USSR Interior Ministry press center: To avoid bloodshed, the demands of the fighters were met—that is, they were given military equipment. This is explained by the fact that the military group was surrounded by children and other civilians. The military equipment has not yet been returned.

Shatalin: 'War' on Armenia-Azerbaijan Border

PM0505165491 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 May 91 Union Edition pp 1-2

[S. Mostovshchikov report incorporating interview with Colonel General Yu. Shatalin, commander of the USSR MVD Internal Troops—date, place of interview not stated—under general heading: "Azerbaijan-Armenia Border: More Bloodshed"]

[Text] In recent days the conflict has taken such a tragic turn that high-ranking officials at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] are unequivocally calling the events a civil war between two republics. Hatred and confrontation have reached such a pitch that no one can now rely on the 100-percent accuracy of the information arriving from various sources from the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

The epicenters of the armed conflicts are the regions close to the villages of Chaykend (or, in its Armenian form, Getashen) and Martunashen in Azerbaijan's Khanlarskiy Rayon, which are inhabited by Armenians. According to figures quoted by the POSTFAKTUM agency, citing David Vartanyan, chairman of the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet Commission for External Relations, 2,500 people live in the village of Getashen, including 1,150 women, 571 children, and 710 pensioners. In Martunashen there are 260 people, including 100 women, 29 children, and 120 pensioners.

The crux of the present conflict, as seen by the Armenians, looks like this: The Azerbaijanis, with the support of the USSR MVD Internal Troops, are forcibly deporting the peaceful Armenian population of these villages. Moreover the center has allegedly done a political deal with Azerbaijan, and is closing its eyes to the atrocities being perpetrated, in return for assurances that Azerbaijan will sign the Union treaty.

The Azerbaijani interpretation of events goes roughly like this: Nothing of the kind is happening. The republic OMON [special purpose militia detachment] is simply trying to carry out an operation to issue passports to the population of these villages. Furthermore, it is constantly necessary to repel attacks by well-equipped subunits of Armenian guerrillas who are shelling the border regions.

The USSR MVD's own reports only record that both sides are engaged in real combat operations involving the use of automatic weapons, grenade throwers, mortars, antiaircraft devices, and armored carriers. There are no precise data on the distribution of forces, but according to some estimates about 100 Armenian guerrillas are concentrated in the region of Chaykend (Getashen) alone, opposed by approximately the same number of armed Azerbaijanis.

According to Colonel General Yuriy Shatalin, commander of the USSR MVD Internal Troops, reports of the forcible deportation of the Armenian population are not in accordance with reality. The commander categorically rejects accusations that he is leading this operation on the spot, together with the Azerbaijanis—if only by virtue of the fact that he is in Moscow, and has not been to Getashen. His people are trying to avoid becoming involved in the conflict at all, despite the fact that 14 servicemen have already been taken hostage and nine have been killed.

Colonel General Shatalin is convinced that the talk of deportation was prompted by the evacuation from

Getashen of 107 women and babies and two old men, at their own request. Three helicopters took them out of the village at 1930 hours on 4 May, after several hours of wrangling with the Armenian guerrillas, who would not let the people go. According to Yuriy Shatalin, some of the women even came to blows with the guerrillas, who were stopping them from boarding the helicopters.

The women, children, and old men were taken to Stepanakert, where this time it was the Azerbaijani OMON who would not let them go. Yuriy Shatalin says that the situation is becoming frankly intolerable. People have become pawns in a political game. It is impossible to live in Getashen, because, the colonel general says, the situation there is worse than it was in Leningrad during the blockade—there is nothing at all: no lights, no water, no food. The women, children, and old men want to leave, but are not being allowed to.

"You understand, one thing is important for us," the colonel general says, "to ensure the safety of innocent citizens. Today I gave the order to make nine more helicopter flights to evacuate people. But only women and children. And men—over the age of 75."

[Mostovshchikov] Yuriy Vasilyevich, Armenia's permanent representative in Moscow, Feliks Mamikoyan, stated in an interview for POSTFAKTUM that you called him and threatened to blow up a nuclear power station on Armenian territory....

[Shatalin] I did call him, it's true, but excuse me, I'm no terrorist, and I don't blow up power stations. My people are guarding that station. When I received information from the KGB that people are planning to attack it, I called the permanent mission, because the Armenian leadership refused to talk to me. I said I cannot allow any fooling around with things like the power station. Perhaps I spoke sharply, even crudely, but you must understand my position, when the Internal Troops are trying, at the cost of their lives, to normalize the situation and save innocent people, and in return they are accused of all the mortal sins....

[Mostovshchikov] How do you assess the present situation on the Armenia-Azerbaijan border?

[Shatalin] The situation is grave: There is a war on. I think we should tell the truth, stop pretending, and look for a way out of the situation.

Yerevan Reviews Border Situation 5 May

NC0605082091 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] According to an Internal Affairs Ministry report, the situation on our republic's border regions as of last night was as follows:

Noyemberyanskiy Rayon: (?Sporadic) shooting occurred at night, but the situation was calm during the day.

Idzhevanskiy Rayon: The night was calm; however, during the day a military helicopter continuously circled over the rayon. Soviet troop concentrations have been observed on the Azerbaijani side.

Tavushskiy Rayon: Aygebar and Movsesgeg villages came under fire at around 0300. The situation was calm during the day.

Krasnoselskiy Rayon: Artsvashen remains surrounded by a 700-strong Soviet Army regiment. The situation was calm at night and during the day.

Gorisskiy Rayon: Troops have been observed to mass at night at the Azerbaijani village of (?Malibeyli) and in Lachin. The tractor driver and a team leader from (?Aravast) village have been trapped. [words indistinct]

The situation is (?stable) in Vardenisskiy, Sisianskiy, Vaykskiy, Yekhegnadzorskiy and Araratskiy Rayons.

Statement Issued on Armenia-Azerbaijan Situation

LD0505120491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1139 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 May (TASS)—According to a statement issued here today by the USSR Ministry of Defense, the situation in areas close to the border between Azerbaijan and Armenia, and also in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, has sharply deteriorated.

Virtually every day, the statement says, there is shooting, sabotage, and attacks on villages, farms, roads, and transport. Members of both Azerbaijani and Armenian communities have been killed. Armed resistance to the forces of law and order is increasing. Military outposts and patrols have been fired on and attacked 115 times so far this year. The number of dead and wounded servicemen is increasing.

The presence in the region of numerous armed formations, not sanctioned by USSR legislation, is provoking tension and destabilizing the situation. Over 100 firearms, 7,000 rounds of ammunition, and about a half of a tonne of explosives have been confiscated since 15 April this year alone.

Since all this creates a serious threat to the population's security, the USSR MVD, the USSR KGB, and the USSR Ministry of Defense are carrying out appropriate measures to disarm illegal formations and to confiscate weapons in accordance with the 25 July 1990 USSR presidential Decree "On the Banning of Armed Formations not Sanctioned by USSR Legislation, and the Confiscation of Illegally Held Weapons."

Baku News Conference Views Armenian Relations

LD0405203191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 4 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Sorrow has again burst into the homes of the peaceful inhabitants of Kazakhskiy Rayon on the border with Armenia. Dozens of houses have been destroyed and many have been injured. Only after the military suppressed the bandits' artillery positions did relative calm prevail. It was from such long-range guns seized by the military that border villages and towns in Azerbaijan were fired upon.

Near the town of Gyandzha militia officers detained an inhabitant from Noyemberyanskiy Rayon in Armenia, Seram Serzhikovich Akhnazaryan. Weapons, explosives and a map were confiscated from him. He admitted that, with his four accomplices, who are now being sought by the law-enforcement organizations of Azerbaijan, he infiltrated here to carry out terrorist acts at airports and on the railways.

A news conference was held in Baku today at which journalists were told about the resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Azerbiajan, which notes in particular that the neighboring republic is setting up footholds in the areas of Azerbaijan solidly inhabited by Armenians for its own military formations. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Azerbaijan resolutely protests against examination of the issue of Nagorno- Karabakh, Republic of Azerbaijan, at an extraordinary USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the convocation of which is being sought by Armenia.

Armenian MVD on Presence of Soviet Troops

NC0505092591 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 3 May 91

["Statement by the Armenian Republic's Internal Affairs Ministry"—radio headline]

[Text] The USSR Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD], in conjunction with the leadership of Azerbaijan, has recently implemented a premeditated plan for the deportation of the Armenian populations in Khanlarskiy and Shaumyanovskiy Rayons and in Nagorno-Karabakh. The deportations are accompanied by mass atrocities. According to inconclusive reports, a section of Martunashen village has been virtually burnt down. In addition, 17 people were killed and 20 wounded. Searches are being conducted in the settlements of Nagorno-Karabakh and people are being arrested, detained, and tortured. All these acts are being committed by the USSR MVD's Internal Troops and the special detachment of the Azerbaijani MVD. These groups are resorting to every means possible to force the people of Getashen and Martunashen to abandon their native homes.

The Internal Troops serving at Armenia's border regions not only do not take any practical measure to defend the Armenian population, but peaceful Armenian citizens are killed or injured and houses are burnt or destroyed as a result of the provocative acts by these troops. Yet another monstrous crime is being perpetrated against our people. General Shatalin, commander of the USSR MVD's Internal Troops, and a number of high-level officials at the USSR MVD have organized these acts. They provoke emotions by misleading the public and by resorting to short-sighted measures. In this way they create resentment and indignation amongst the people. The people have started to harass the Internal Troops. Cases of seizure of arms and military hardware from them have been reported. The people are demanding an investigation into the crimes, punishment of the criminals, and the withdrawal of all USSR MVD subunits from Armenia. These units, in fact, are doing nothing to defend the borders.

At the same time there is proof that some Internal Troops officials are engaged in illegal activities detrimental to the interests of the Armenian Republic. The republic's MVD is investigating all the crimes. A number of Internal Troops officers were questioned. The Armenian MVD does not believe the continued presence in the republic of USSR MVD subunits is appropriate. However, we should not commit the previous mistakes. All the arms and hardware seized by the population from the servicemen should be handed over to the Armenian Republic MVD to be used in the defense of the borders. No illegal acts should be committed against the servicemen and their families. It should be realized and remembered that the Soviet Army soldiers serving in the republic are fulfilling an important role in the defense of its international borders and transportation communications. Therefore, any such acts against them will be prevented and the culprits will be called to account.

Compatriots, grave trials await us. Only by being united and in agreement can we defend our interests. As such, any action must be coordinated with the state organs and institutions; any individualistic action cannot be permitted. Those who at this grave hour attempt pillage or brigandage in the name of national interests will be severely punished.

MVD, Defense Ministry Transcaucasus Statement

LD0405173991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1632 GMT 4 May 91

[Joint statement issued by the press centers of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) and Ministry of Defense; place and date not given]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Apr (TASS)— "In recent days in Armenia there have been provocative incidents involving banditry against subunits of the Soviet Army and USSR MVD internal troops. So, in May in the town of Dilizhan, Armenian fighters blocked and disarmed a subunit of USSR MVD internal troops, seizing four armored personnel carries and 45 submachine guns. A group of soldiers from the Transcaucasus military district that came to their aid was unable to use their equipment and weapons because it would have led to numerous casualties among the population.

The number of dead and wounded among the soldiers of the USSR MVD troops and subunits of the USSR

Ministry of Defense is growing. Incidents of terrorist acts being carried out by Armenian extremists against soldiers are becoming more frequent. Outstanding among them is the murder of Colonel Blakhotin in Rostov.

All this cannot but arouse the just indignation of all personnel of the USSR Armed Forces and the MVD.

The campaign aimed at discrediting subunits of the Soviet Army and USSR MVD internal troops that has developed in the Armenian mass media cannot be ignored. Provocative, inflammatory statements can be heard ever more frequently emanating from Yerevan. Despite the demands of the USSR Constitution and the decree of the USSR president on the disarmament and breaking-up of illegal formations, efforts to create their own army are increasing.

All this is fraught with a further escalation of violence, a worsening of the situation, and ultimatly more victims. The entire responsibility for the crimes being committed and for the possible tragic development of events rests with the Armenian leadership and those who are kindling the conflict, using provocative actions against soldiers for this purpose.

Under these conditions, the USSR MVD and the USSR Ministry of Defense will be forced to take all necessary measures to prevent an escalation of violence; to halt extremist actions against soldiers and the workers of internal affairs bodies; and to protect their lives, honor, and dignity from these criminal encroachments."

Armenian, MVD Views on Village Incident

PM0405215491 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 91 p 1

[Feature comprising report by correspondent V. Aloyan; interview with Colonel General Yu. Shatalin, commander of the USSR MVD Internal Troops, by V. Mamontov; place and date not given; Yu. Sorokin report on 4 May Moscow news conference by Armenian President L. Ter-Petrosyan; and AZERINFORM report: "They Are Shooting Again... Different Versions of the Same Conflict"]

[Excerpt] **KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent V. Aloyan:**

On the eve of May Day the internal troops, reinforced by the Azerbaijan OMON [special purpose militia detachment], surrounded the Armenian villages of Getashen and Martunashen in Azerbaijan's Khanlarskiy Rayon. The houses came under fire from tank guns and heavy machine guns mounted on armored carriers. The village of Martunashen no longer exists.

Eyewitnesses speak of violence against the inhabitants. On the first day about 50 hostages were taken, including women. Some of them were exchanged for servicemen who had been taken hostage by the people of Getashen. For a long time appeals to Moscow requesting permission to take out the wounded produced no results. On the third day, at last, two military helicopters flew into the region of combat operations. It was stated that permission would be granted to take out the wounded and dead in numbers equal to the number of weapons surrendered by the people of Getashen. The defenders had to make concessions, because many of the wounded were in danger of dying if they did not receive medical attention.

These events were not unexpected. In recent weeks the situation has been growing more heated day by day. The Armenian leadership had repeatedly warned members of the USSR Security Council, but the planned action took its course.

The active involvement of USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] troop subunits shows that such conclusions are not far from the truth. There is other confirmation of this too. On the evening of 2 May Colonel General Yu. Shatalin called F. Mamikonyan, Armenia's permanent representative in Moscow, and issued an ultimatum: Unless the hostages are freed by midnight, the Army will launch an offensive. Do not forget, the general went on, that I have the keys to the Armenian Nuclear Power Station in my pocket. We will surround the permanent mission in Moscow and arrest you and your staff.

The "military victory" over two remote mountain villages, cut off from the world, will not turn into a moral victory. That is already clear today. A fierce exchange of fire is in progress along virtually the entire border between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

[Interview by V. Mamontov] Colonel General Yu. Shatalin, Commander of the USSR MVD Internal Troops:

The internal troops are participating in the action, but these are units under the operational command of the Azerbaijan minister of internal affairs, and subordinate to him by law.

As for the conversation, yes, it really took place. Its prehistory is as follows: Armenian guerrillas, sending women and children in front, surrounded a subunit that was guarding the border between the warring parties. To prevent bloodshed among peaceful inhabitants, the subunit's officers decided not to offer resistance, and became hostages. The guerrillas seized weapons and equipment.

I called L. Ter-Petrosyan. He refused to talk to me. I then gave the permanent representative an ultimatum: Unless you let the soldiers go, MVD forces will detain the staffers of the Armenian missions in Rostov-na-Donu, Tbilisi, and Moscow.

Of course, I had no right to do that, but I was trying a psychological attack, if I can call it that, and you will agree that that is better than an armed attack. The objective was achieved, the soldiers were released. As for the nuclear power station: We received information that they were preparing to attack it. We have our security guard there. I warned that the consequences will rest with the attackers.

I do not want to be misunderstood. This was tough talking, but it was in pursuit of just one objective: to free the hostages.

[Yu. Sorokin report] Armenian President L. Ter-Petrosyan:

Armenian Supreme Soviet Chairman Levon Ter-Petrosyan met with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev in the Kremlin 3 May, and yesterday he gave a news conference at the Armenian permanent mission in Moscow.

Ter-Petrosyan said he had been trying to get this meeting since 22 April. The meeting lasted an hour and a half—45 minutes one-on-one, plus 45 minutes in the presence of V. Kryuchkov and B. Pugo.

In L. Ter-Petrosyan's opinion, which he expounded to the president, what happened 30 April in the Armenian villages of Getashen and Martunashen, which are located on the territory of Azerbaijan, was an act of state terrorism, since on this occasion, unlike Sumgait, troops took part in the pogroms. According to his information, Army subunits entered the villages at 1000 hours on the pretext of checking the passport regime, and were followed by subunits of the internal troops and the Azerbaijani OMON; a crowd of violent thugs brought up the rear. The shooting began on the outskirts, while the troops were moving toward the center of the village. There were, according to Ter-Petrosyan, some "brave guys" who pulled the pins from their grenades and plunged into the midst of the soldiers, demanding an end to the "attack" and threatening that otherwise they would blow themselves up together with the soldiers. Hostages were taken on both sides, and were exchanged later, but the fate of 23 of them, according to Ter-Petrosyan, is not yet known.

In his opinion, what happened could lead to unpredictably tragic consequences, since the relatively stable situation that had become established recently has been disrupted. L. Ter-Petrosyan claims that the action was planned in advance by Azerbaijani President A. Mutalibov with the support of the center's "dark forces."

M.S. Gorbachev, according to Ter-Petrosyan, promised at the meeting to stop Army operations in the region of the villages of Getashen and Martunashen, ensure the unhampered landing of helicopters carrying food and medical supplies, and not allow the deportation of the Armenian population.

Ter-Petrosyan also stated that the plan for a settlement of the Karabakh problem that was supported last fall by Ye. Primakov remains in force: Armenia is prepared to "quit the game" if the legitimate authorities are restored in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and free elections are held to the oblast soviet and the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet.

According to Ter-Petrosyan, Azerbaijani President A. Mutalibov was invited to the Kremlin the same day, by the same means—through the Defense Ministry. "But," Ter-Petrosyan said, "he and I did not run into each other in Gorbachev's reception room." [Sorokin ends] [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Rules Out Deportation of Armenians

NC0505114791 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0400 GMT 5 May 91

[Text] The Armenian Republic Council of Ministers' Press Center has reported that President Gorbachev has sent a message to Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet, through Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR Committee for State Security, saying that he has ruled out the deportation of Armenians in Getashen and Martunashen. He said that no one has the right to force the inhabitants of those villages to abandon their houses.

Central Asia

Kazakh Official on Draft Union Treaty

91US0476A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Apr 91 Union edition p 1

[Interview with Professor S. Sartayev, Kazakh SSR people's deputy, by Ye. Bayzhanov in Alma-Ata; date not given: "A Union of the Sovereign? It Is Possible"]

[Text] **As you know, the draft Union treaty has been sent to the republic parliaments for consideration after being approved by the plenipotentiary representatives of eight Union and 18 autonomous republics. The range of assessments of the document both official and personal that are being received from the parliaments is quite wide, which makes it difficult to predict exactly when the treaty is going to be finally approved and signed.**

Here is a conversation with Professor S. Sartayev, Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] people's deputy, a lawyer who, as a plenipotentiary representative of the republic, took part in drafting the Union treaty and signing the treaty protocol. He talks about the way the draft "Treaty on the Union of Sovereign Republics" was received in Kazakhstan, whose president and parliament consistently speak for the quickest legalization of the new Union.

[Bayzhanov] Sultan Sartayevich, your signature is among others appended to the draft treaty protocol. Does this mean that the published text corresponds fully to your position?

[Sartayev] Not at all. I signed the document primarily because we had to achieve some concrete, tangible results in this sphere as soon as possible. Whatever you think about the text of the treaty, you have to admit that it represents a realistic foundation from which you can proceed further. The concept defended by the republics found very substantial expression in it, but in spite of this some of its provisions need considerably more work. This is especially true of Article 5, which deals with the division of powers between the Union and the republics.

[Bayzhanov] According to its current wording, the Union has the power to resolve, within the framework of exclusive and mutual jurisdiction, all the issues of any importance. In my view, this is nothing basically new compared to the previous practice.

[Sartayev] You are right. In its present form this article and, primarily, the list of mutual powers, can make it possible for the center to preserve its dictatorship in all vital issues. Where is the solution? Nowhere other than in a mechanism for the enforcement of these legal norms. We have to specify that the priority in resolving "mutual" problems should be given to the republics. This should also include legislative priority, (i.e. republic laws should have supremacy). In other words, the so-called "competitive law" [konkuriruyushcheye pravo] should be affirmed for the republics in this case.

The rejection of a unitary system should be evident in the very name of the treaty. We proposed to the Federation Council to name it the "Treaty on the Union of Sovereign States." Many people do not have any problem with that. But I do not like to equate the notions of "republic" and "state." When we are talking about a republic, as opposed to a monarchy, we emphasize the form of the government. The notion of a "state" is much wider; it embraces all forms of leadership and structure, whatever the character of its social system and political regime, etc. may be. During the referendum, by the way, the majority of the people of Kazakhstan (94.1 percent of those who voted) showed their support for the "union of states."

[Bayzhanov] They are writing a lot now about the specific interests of the center, about its immunity to the democratization of the federative structure. One may get the impression that the "center-republics" confrontation may prove fatal.

[Sartayev] A new stereotypical notion of "the center" has emerged in the public mentality. The notion has a negative undertone because this basically negative concept gets linked with an ambivalent attitude toward specific leading personalities and toward concrete policies. The problem is not whether we need the center or not. It is clear that we cannot do without a coordinator of our mutual actions. The problem lies in the qualitative characteristics: powers, rights, the center's place in the government structure.

The center does have its special interests. But the fact that a certain "gap" is inevitable between the interests of the center and those of the republics does not mean that a proper balance of interests cannot be achieved in the future either. It can be achieved, but for that we need the center to be represented by people who fully understand the new realities of federative relations, who can make a choice for the benefit of the long-term, basic interests of the country rather than favor fast, fleeting advantages.

After the Union treaty is signed, a renewal of and change in Union structures should ensue. I mean new elections of the president and Union parliament, and the establishment of a new government and other organs, based on the provisions of the Union treaty. In my view, this is the perspective that worries representatives of current center.

[Bayzhanov] A security council was recently set up under the USSR president. Should the existence of this body and its functions be reflected in the Union treaty?

[Sartayev] There is only one thing I can say. Like our President N. Nazarbayev, I am very surprised that Union structures are being speedily established and that that process is occurring simultaneously with the preparation of the Union treaty. It seems they want to present us with the fact, and make the treaty fit existing structures or those that are hurriedly being set up.

I would like to add that Union organs are mononational in essence; they basically represent one ethnic entity. We suggest that they be formed from representatives of different republics. That would agree with the principles of a federative formation of sovereign states.

[Bayzhanov] Many people are familiar with the idea of eliminating the post of the president and handing the highest executive power over to the Federation Council. What do you think?

[Sartayev] If the issue of transforming the Union into a confederation were on the agenda, such an idea would have been justified. But the only goal that seems realistic at present is to transfer from a rigidly centralized, unitarian state to a truly federative structure where elements of a confederation may be of little importance. To expand the rights of the Federation Council in the Union treaty is a different matter.

[Bayzhanov] Now that autonomous republics are entering the arena of internal politics, complex political-legal issues are emerging which are tied to the variations in the statuses of the republics...

[Sartayev] Yes, and the content of the Union treaty depends directly on the solution of these problems. Any variations in the statuses of the republics, conditioned by their joining the Union (whether directly or within another republic), would inevitably cause differences in their rights and duties. The provision of Article 1 of the draft which stipulates equal rights for treaty members sounds very democratic, but it is not clear how it can be put in practice. It is hard to imagine that the Russian autonomy would be given the same volume of rights as the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] of which it will be a part. In short, we need to be extremely precise in the legal sense when we are dealing with the issue of republic status. Otherwise, we will face unsurmountable barriers.

Here is an example. Most of the autonomous republics stated their wish to remain in the Russian Federation, except Bashkiria and Tatarstan. Nevertheless, they declared their right to have the same representation quota in the Supreme Soviet of the country and in other Union bodies as do other Union republics. We could not come to any agreement with them in this respect. We could not agree even on a compromise version which outlines the creation of the upper and lower houses of parliament. As you know, the draft contains an alternative helping to resolve this problem. But this alternative cannot be accepted because it violates the principle of equality of Union problems [as published]. In such a case the RSFSR will receive more deputy seats than any other Union republic.

It might be interesting to mention that in some other areas (sovereignty in foreign policy, for instance) the former autonomous republics do not present such far-reaching claims.

[Bayzhanov] Article 23 of the draft, dealing with enforcement of the treaty, has different interpretations. There are opinions that the 1922 treaty will be effective for the republics that refuse to sign this one...

[Sartayev] To put it mildly, this interpretation is incorrect. If such an occasion arises, the law on secession will kick in. Any reference to the 1922 treaty is unfounded, for the single reason, at least, that some of the republics were not part of the USSR then or belonged to it as part of some other formation.

I am more concerned with Article 25, on the appendixes to the treaty, which outlines the procedure, mechanism, and time periods for the enforcement of its articles. I am convinced that these appendixes should be approved by the republics' Supreme Soviets before the Union treaty is signed and not be given to the center for its consideration.

[Bayzhanov] Should a republic power of veto be incorporated in the treaty?

[Sartayev] That is the easiest way to ruin the Union. I think that after all the participants agree on the basic principles of the treaty they will be able to resolve arguments with the aid of other procedures.

[Bayzhanov] Here is my final question, Sultan Sartayevich. Lithuanian leader V. Landsbergis described the draft Union treaty as "rather paradoxical." Do you agree with such an assessment?

[Sartayev] I do, completely. Our society is in a state of transition. We seem to be living in two dimensions. Entangled with our past, we are reaching for our future. Quite possibly, the text of this global document, drafted by us, ordinary mortals, could not be any other way, it could not be uncontroversial, it could not be removed from our paradoxical existence.

The tumor of unitarism cannot be removed in a minute. But it is important to start this undertaking. The union of the sovereign is possible, you know...